

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held on Thursday 9 October 2025.

PRESENT: Councillors J Thompson (Chair), I Blades, D Branson, D Coupe, M McClintock, I Morrish, J Ryles, M Saunders and G Wilson

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: E Andrews, F Farooqui, C Pearson, L Pearson, D Smith, E Smith and E Walker

OFFICERS: A Glossop, R Harwood, S Thompson, P Wilson, S Bonner and T Frankland

25/25 **WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the Fire Evacuation Procedure.

25/26 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None received.

25/27 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Name of Councillor	Type of Interest	Item/Nature of Interest
Councillor David Coupe	Non-Pecuniary	Agenda Item 5, Item 4 (5 Pennymann Way), Ward Councillor
Councillor Jan Ryles	Non-Pecuniary	Agenda Item 5, Item 5 (Church Halls, Kings Road), Ward Councillor
Councillor Graham Wilson	Non-Pecuniary	Agenda Item 5, Item 1 (Turford Avenue Social Club), Ward Councillor

25/28 **MINUTES - PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 4 SEPTEMBER 2025**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held on 4 September 2025 were submitted and approved as a correct record.

25/29 **SCHEDULE OF REMAINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE**

SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 4.13.2 – ORDER OF BUSINESS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rules 4.8.25 the Chair proposed a motion without notice, which was seconded and agreed, to change the order of business. The motion proposed that Agenda Item 5 ("Schedule of Planning Applications to be considered by Committee") be considered in the following order:

ORDERED that the following applications be determined as shown:

Items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 2.

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

25/0190/MAJ, TURFORD AVENUE SOCIAL CLUB, Turford Avenue, MIDDLESBROUGH, TS3 9AT, Erection of 10no. bungalows including associated works and landscaping

Members were advised that the application site was Turford Avenue Social Club and permission was sought for the erection of ten bungalows including associated works and

landscaping. Members heard that the principle of the proposed development was considered to be acceptable, being residential development in an area with established residential properties. The design, layout and arrangement of the bungalows were all deemed to be of a good quality that was in accordance with the relevant local and national policies. Neighbouring properties and technical services had been consulted and no objections had been raised.

The application site was a roughly rectangular-shaped site located on the eastern side of Turford Avenue. It was located on the site of the former Turford Avenue social club, which had since been demolished and the site cleared. Burnholme Avenue wrapped around the north and east of the site, with the southern boundary being shared with an adjacent place of worship (the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints).

The layout could be described as two lines of residential properties, which were positioned back-to-back with the front elevations facing east and west. Two pairs of semi-detached properties and a detached property would face west onto Turford Avenue and the same would face east onto Burnholme Avenue. The proposals would provide two off-street parking spaces per dwelling. Boundary treatments would be varied across the site, with decorative low brick wall and railings fronting all properties, with two-metre-high timber fencing to separate rear gardens and one-metre-high timber fencing round the BNG planting area. The dwellings would be constructed in traditional materials to complement the surrounding residential properties.

Overall, the application was considered to be a quality sustainable development, which would assist economic growth in the town and through providing bungalows in this part of Middlesbrough added to the local housing stock. It had been shown that this site was considered to be a suitable site for residential development and the design and layout of the proposals had been appraised as being largely in line with local policy and guidance.

It was considered the proposals would have a positive impact on the character of the area and not affect any existing nearby residents. On balance, the proposals were deemed not to conflict with local or national planning policies, and there were no technical reasons why the proposed development should be refused.

The officer view was to approve conditionally.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A Member queried if there would be two entrances to the site, as there may be congestion around a local school and nursery. It was clarified that the proposal was in line with the Tees Valley Highway Design guide.

The Chair invited the agent to speak in support of the application and the following points were raised:

- The site was currently neglected and the bungalows would be built with traditional materials which would enhance the aesthetic of the area.
- The bungalows would provide accessible housing for 10 households.
- There was ample off-street parking per bungalow.
- The applicant had supplied the Local Planning Authority with a copy of their provisional Nutrient Credit Certificate.

A Member queried if the developer was financially viable. It was clarified that, while this was not a material planning consideration, the developer had completed other similar developments in the recent past and was in a position to begin on this proposal.

A discussion took place about space for vehicular activity on Turford Avenue. It was clarified that the plans were compliant from this perspective.

ORDERED that the application be Approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

25/0416/CO, 41 BOW STREET, Middlesbrough, TS1 4BU, Retrospective Change of use from dwelling (C3) to HMO (C4)

The Planning Officer presented Members with an application which sought retrospective planning approval for the conversion of a mid-terraced property at 41 Bow Street from a two-bedroom residential dwelling into a 4-bed House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

The application site was located within a predominantly residential street and formed part of a triangular block. The dwellings fronted Bow Street with alley way access at the rear. There had been an objection from the Ward Councillor relating to impact on character and appearance of the area, the proposals resulting in a poor standard of accommodation, highway issues, drainage and the proposal being of an incompatible use.

There had been no comments received as part of the neighbour consultations. The proposal was acceptable in principle, however officer concerns related to living conditions for future occupiers. Two out of the four internal bedroom spaces did not accord with the Nationally Described Space Standards. The communal accommodation including rear amenity space would be of limited size and poor layout, causing a poor standard of living. The proposal was therefore contrary to the Council's adopted Interim Policy on the Conversion and Sub-Division of buildings for residential use. Development proposals were considered to unlikely materially change the demand for on-street car parking which was provided within streets surrounding the property.

The proposed HMO accommodation failed to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation and adequate means of amenity for future occupiers. The proposal was therefore contrary to the Council's Conversion Policy, Policy DC1 and Para 135 of the NPPF.

The properties fronted the public footway and were two-storey in scale. Design details such as ground floor bay windows were consistent along the street along and the terrace comprises render. The proposal was for the change of use only and did not contain any external alterations or extensions to the property. All bedrooms contained an en-suite. Bin storage and cycle spaces were provided to the rear.

It was considered that, on balance, the HMO accommodation did not meet the requirements of the Councils Conversion Policy in terms of size, space and usability and amenity, and does not provide a level of accommodation suitable for long term accommodation. It would represent a reduced quality and intensification of accommodation for a property which was already very limited in its provisions. This was fundamentally against the Local Plan aspirations / policy expectations and the thrust of National Planning Guidance and there were no material planning considerations which would outweigh these matters.

Decisions to approve could be made where they were contrary to the Local Plan and other adopted planning guidance where there were material planning considerations which indicated otherwise. However, in this instance, there were no material planning considerations which suggested a decision away from established Policy and guidance should be taken. The site-specific impacts had been considered as part of the assessment.

The application therefore had to be determined against these established policies and in view of the above, the application was therefore recommended for refusal. The Planning Manager advised that although the recommendation within the report was to refuse and enforce, although the properties had been converted, they had not been occupied and therefore the officer recommendation was to refuse, rather than refuse and enforce.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

Members raised concerns about the application owing to potential overcrowding and the potential impact on parking arrangements in the immediate area.

The Chair invited the agent to speak in support of the application.

The agent spoke in support of the application which included the following points:

- The agent had become involved in the application at a late stage.
- The application should not be seen as retrospective as although internal works had commenced, the property was not being used/had not been used as an HMO previously.
- The Council had previously indicated Planning approval would not be needed if works were completed before Article 4 was implemented but this position had now changed.
- Only one room was 7 square metres, with guidance stating minimum size was 6.5 metres squared.
- The house was vacant, and the proposal brought it back to life.

A conversation took place during which it was clarified that, with regards to Article 4, there had

been a period of approximately 12 months between the Council issuing a statement on the matter and Article 4 being implemented.

At this point in the meeting the Ward Councillor was invited to present her case in objection of the application, her presentation included the following points:

- While there was a lack of local objections, many people may not have fully realised what the situation was.
- Unsure how unrelated people would live comfortably in such a small space.
- This application would crowd people out.
- The house would make a reasonable family home rather than for four unrelated people.

A conversation took place during which it was raised that the application was inadequate and the property and bedroom sizes were too small for the intended purpose.

ORDERED that the application be refused for the reasons detailed in the report and subject to the amended recommendation presented by the Planning Manager.

25/0417/COU, 27 WICKLOW STREET, Middlesbrough, TS1 4RG, Retrospective change of use from dwelling (C3) to HMO (C4)

The Planning Officer provided Members with an overview of the application which was for the conversion of a mid-terraced property at 27 Wicklow Street from a two-bedroom residential dwelling into a 4-bed House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

Permission was sought retrospectively. The application site was located within a predominantly residential street. The dwellings fronted Wicklow Street with alley way access at the rear. There had been an objection from the Ward Councillor relating to impact on character and appearance of the area, the proposals resulting in a poor standard of accommodation, highway issues, drainage and the proposal being of an incompatible use.

There had been no comments received as part of the neighbour consultations. The proposal was acceptable in principle. However, officer concerns related to living conditions for future occupiers. The internal bedroom spaces would be small in footprint. The communal accommodation, including rear amenity space would be of limited size and poor layout, causing a poor standard of living.

The proposal was therefore contrary to the Council's adopted Interim Policy on the Conversion and Sub-Division of buildings for residential use. Development proposals were considered unlikely to not materially change the demand for on-street car parking which was provided within the streets surrounding the property. The proposed HMO accommodation failed to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation and adequate means of amenity for future occupiers. The proposal was therefore contrary to the Council's Conversion Policy, Policy DC1 and Para 135 of the NPPF.

The application site was located within a predominantly residential area with the properties along Wicklow Street formed as terraces. The properties fronted the public footway and were two-storey in scale. Design details, such as ground floor bay windows, were consistent along the street along and the terrace comprised render.

The proposal was for the change of use only and did not contain any external alterations or extensions to the property. All bedrooms contained an en-suite. Bin storage and cycle spaces were to the rear.

It was considered that, on balance the HMO accommodation did not meet the requirements of the Council's Conversion Policy in terms of size, space and usability and amenity, and did not provide a level of accommodation suitable for long term accommodation. It would represent a reduced quality of accommodation for a property which was already very limited in its provisions. This was fundamentally against the Local Plan aspirations / policy expectations and the thrust of National Planning Guidance and there were no material planning considerations which would outweigh these matters.

The Planning Manager advised that although the recommendation within the report was to refuse and enforce, although the properties had been converted, they had not been occupied and therefore the officer recommendation was to refuse, rather than refuse and enforce.

The Chair invited the agent to speak to the application and the below was raised:

- This was a similar application to that listed in item 3 and the process involved in submitting the application, and associated concerns regarding the implementation of Article 4 were also similar.

The Chair invited the Ward Member for Newport to speak on the application. The Ward Member spoke in objection to the application which included:

- There was very little outdoor space.
- In terms of the upstairs, the location of the boiler was identified as being potentially inconvenient for tenants, being within one of the bedrooms presenting difficulty for communal access / servicing / repair access.
- In terms of parking, this was limited in this area and so would be exacerbated if this application was approved. The property was more suitable for a family home.

ORDERED that the application be refused for the reasons detailed in the report and based on the amended recommendation made by the Planning Manager.

25/0433/FUL, 1, Pennyman Way, Middlesbrough, TS8 9BL, Retrospective erection of detached garage to side and single storey extension

The Planning Officer provided Members with an overview of an application which sought retrospective approval for a single storey rear extension and a detached garage to the front/side of the existing dwelling.

The application followed a previous refusal for the erection of a detached garage which was of notable height and was to be rendered. This element had now been amended and was of a reduced height, comprising brickwork to the front elevation. As originally submitted, this application also sought planning consent for a rear dormer, also retrospectively.

Due to the dormer being contrary to the Councils adopted design guidance, in relation to its design, scale and impact on the character and appearance of the area, it has since been removed from this proposal. As such, the plans and description had been amended to omit this and it was intended this would be dealt with separately.

Objections had been received from nearby residential properties. These highlighted concerns relating to the scale and appearance of the development in that it would be out of keeping with the host property and street scene which would result in overdevelopment of the site. Concerns had also been raised regarding loss of privacy and overlooking to nearby residents.

Considering the removal of the dormer proposal and the reduced height of the garage, this would, on balance, not have harmfully dominated the host property or wider street scene and would also have no significant detrimental impact on adjacent properties.

Whilst there would be some impact, it would not be so significant as to warrant refusal of the scheme. As such the scheme was in accordance with relevant Local Plan Policies CS5 and DC1 and the provisions of the Council's Design SPD.

The application property was a single-storey semi-detached dwelling with a detached single storey garage to the side/rear. It was located within an established residential area comprising predominantly semi-detached single storey properties, although some detached dwellings were evident which were generally set back from the road.

The property sits on the boundary with Pennyman Way and High Rifts. It was noted that High Rifts sat lower down and predominantly consisted of detached single storey dwellings.

The application sought permission for the following elements:

- Rear single storey extension (projecting 3.2m from the rear wall with a width of 3.6m and height of 2.9m)
- Detached pitched-roof garage (measuring 8m in length, 3.6m in width with an eaves height of 2.1m and ridge height of 3.3m).

It was considered the application would not cause significant harm to the amenities of the neighbours or to the character and appearance of the dwelling, street or the surrounding area. It was the Planning Authority's view that previous refusal reasons had been adequately overcome. It was recommended that the application be approved.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

Members discussed the possibility of applying of restrictions and also discussed access rights. It was clarified that certain restrictions were already in place.

A Member queried how much larger the proposed garage was to that previously submitted. It was clarified that the size of the length of the garage had increased from approximately five meters to eight meters.

At this point in the meeting, the Chair invited the applicant to speak on his application. The applicant spoke in support which included the following points:

- The garage was only intended to house a classic car
- The original garage had been stood empty and was dilapidated
- Objections received were likely associated with length of time taken, which were understandable.
- Tried to use sympathetic materials such as the roof tiles being reclaimed.
- There had been some compliments received about the structure.
- Tried to undertake some of the work alone.
- Adjoining neighbour was supportive of the application.
- Development looked daunting to non-adjoining neighbours.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

Members sought clarification on the progress of work. It was clarified that work was ready to commence and that a wall identified in a photograph had been demolished. The applicant also clarified that the garage was always intended to be a garage and not a dwelling.

The Chair invited a resident to speak on the application. Speaking in objection of the application, the resident's speech included the following comments:

- Lived in the adjacent property.
- Most of the other 11 objectors could not be at the meeting.
- It was noted that the plan excluded the Dorma extension at the rear of the property.
- The development had been refused in its present form.
- Opposed to flat roof.
- Main concern was the overbearing size of the garage. It would be a prominent feature at the junction of the roads.
- Buildings should not look out of place.
- The proposed structure would be overbearing from the objector's house.
- Allowing this kind of development would affect property lines.
- Due to the proximity between the development and neighbouring property, being only 7 inches, there were serious concerns about trespass. While this would be a civil matter, decisions could be taken to mitigate this prospect.
- This situation had caused a significant amount of stress, and the matter needed to be resolved as quickly as possible.
- All representations heard from neighbours had been objections.

It was clarified for Members that the rear aspect of the dividing fence between the development and neighbouring property would need to be taken down to apply render. It was also clarified that the distance between the fence and the proposed garage remained the same as it did before at approx. seven inches.

A Member commented that when taken in totality they were not comfortable with the increased dimensions of the garage.

ORDERED that the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report and an additional condition restricting the use of the garage.

25/0379/FUL, Church Halls, Kings Road, Middlesbrough, Retrospective - Replacement of windows and doors and Roof Replacement

The Planning Officer provided Members with an overview of an application which sought approval for external alterations including replacement of the natural slate roof with artificial

slate tiles, replacement of timber-framed, single-glazed, vertical sliding sash windows with uPVC-framed, double-glazed, casement windows and replacement of timber doors with steel-faced timber doors. The Planning Officer stated that the intended use of the building was not a consideration of the application as there was no intended change of use.

Members were also advised of an amendment to the report circulated. Since the removal of scaffolding, it was noted that the installed windows were not compliant with those on the original plans. After discussions with the applicant's agent it was clarified the applicant wanted to retain what had been installed.

Objections had been received from several residents highlighting issues regarding the impact on the streetscene; character and appearance of the area; use of inappropriate materials given the age of the building; roof construction; safety concerns; use of the building and parking concerns.

Whilst works could have been done more sensitively and not retrospectively, overall, the energy efficiency of the building had been improved along with its condition because of the works. The works would have enabled a viable use, supporting the building's longer-term conservation. Bringing the building back into use after being unused for such a long period of time would also have been positive to the streetscene and surrounding area. In addition, the works would not unduly impact residents with regards to outlook, privacy and amenity or result in any highway implications. On balance the works were deemed a satisfactory form of development in accordance with relevant policy guidance.

The building was an early Edwardian church hall in the suburb of North Ormesby, north-east of Middlesbrough's central core. It was sited on the corner of Derwent and Jubilee Street, off Kings Road. Surrounding uses were primarily residential terraced streets, with some commercial uses. The application sought retrospective planning approval for external alterations to the building including window and door replacements and a new roof covering.

The Planning Authority was aware that since the application was submitted, further unauthorised works had been carried out by the installation of external grills to the ground floor windows. The grills did not form part of this application and as such were not considered. The owner had been notified and informed that the grills must be removed from the building to avoid enforcement action being taken.

The committee were advised by the Planning Manager that bringing the building back into use after such a long period of time would have been positive to the streetscene and surrounding area. In addition, the works would not unduly impact residents with regards to outlook, privacy and amenity or resulted in any highway implications. Whilst this development had resulted in harm to a non-designated heritage asset, the scale of harm was medium to low. It could be reduced in future with sensitive repair and maintenance and had improved the condition and energy efficiency of the building. A balanced judgment, as required by Policy HI3 of the 2025 Emerging Publication Draft Middlesbrough Local Plan, focused on this development having resulted in a secure and weathertight building, that could enable a viable use, consistent with the building's conservation, as required by paragraphs 210 and 216 of the 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The works deemed a satisfactory form of development in accordance with relevant policy guidance and there were no material considerations that indicated the development should be refused.

The Chair invited questions from the committee.

Members sought clarification that there was no change in use and the Planning Officer clarified that the Church Hall was in the same use class from a Planning perspective.

Members also commented that the Planning Authority should have been informed before works to the building had commenced. Members were keen for this to be made clear in future applications.

The Chair invited a resident to speak to the application. Speaking in objection to the application the resident's speech included the following comments:

- The application was unlikely to result in the building being brought back into use.
- There was no mention of what the building was intended for.
- The Planning Officer's report could have been completed more sympathetically and

the proposal was contrary to Policies CS4, CS5 and DS1.

- Use of materials should be appropriate, those used in the application were not.
- Because of the tiles used on the roof there was a chance the roof could bow or collapse.
- The drawings submitted as part of the application were wrong and there had been no enforcement on this.
- The building was a heritage asset.
- The Church Hall was not a place of worship.
- The current owner had owned the building for 21 years.

The Chair invited questions from the committee.

Members clarified that the intended use of the building could not be considered as material Planning consideration. It was also clarified that concerns relating to the roof were not within Planning's remit but rather Building Control.

A Member stated that the materials used on the roof and the perceived risks should be noted by the committee. The Planning Manager confirmed that the structural stability of the building was not something which could be taken into account in reaching a decision on the application.

Members stated that the materials used on the roof and windows were not in keeping with the building and were unacceptable.

ORDERED that the application be refused based on the materials used on the roof, door and windows were not suitable given the heritage of the building.

25/30

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 187 (29 September 1992).

A Member queried the status of the car wash on Cargo Fleet Lane. Officers clarified there was an ongoing application and a decision would be required shortly.

At this point Councillor Ian Morrish withdrew from the meeting.

The Planning Officer agreed to provide feedback to questions posed by Members.

NOTED

25/31

WEEKLY UPDATE LIST - APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

A Member queried the progress of works at Nunthorpe Grange. The Planning Officer agreed to provide an update to the Member outside of the meeting.

25/32

PLANNING APPEALS

Deferred.

25/33

ANY OTHER URGENT ITEMS WHICH IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIR, MAY BE CONSIDERED.

None.