

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held on Tuesday 2 December 2025.

PRESENT: Councillors J Thompson (Chair), J Rostron (Vice-Chair), D Branson, D Coupe, J Ryles and G Wilson

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: P Bianchi

OFFICERS: A Glossop, R Harwood, J McNally and K Allan

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: I Blades, I Morrish and M Saunders

25/42 **WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, introductions were made and the Fire Evacuation Procedure explained.

It was noted that a routine fire alarm test was scheduled to take place at 10.30.

25/43 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Name of Councillor	Type of Interest	Item/Nature of Interest
Cllr David Branson	Non-Pecuniary	Agenda Item 5, Item 1 (11 Woodlea) Ward Councillor

25/44 **MINUTES - PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2025**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held on 6 November 2025 were submitted and approved as a correct record.

25/45 **SCHEDULE OF 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.

25/0455/FUL, 11, Woodlea, Middlesbrough, TS8 0TX, Retrospective reposition of front door to side, replacement of rear window with glazed double doors, and alterations to windows to side

The Development Control Manager presented an application that sought part retrospective planning permission for several external alterations, including the repositioning of the front door to the side, the replacement of the rear window with glazed double doors, and alterations to the side windows.

The application site was a single-storey bungalow located at the end of a turning head on a cul-de-sac within the Woodlea estate, off Coulby Farm Way. It was within an established residential area comprising mainly two-storey detached dwellings, with some single-storey properties towards the western end. Dwellings were set back from the road, with Stainton Way to the north of the site.

The proposal involved alterations to the principal elevation, including removal of the front door and canopy, replacement with cream render across the elevation, and black composite cladding on the western half. A new bay window was proposed to replace the existing window, retaining a common design feature within the area. Additional changes included repositioning the side door, modifying side windows, and replacing the rear window with glazed French

doors. The design incorporated high-quality materials and modern features, with massing considered subservient to the plot. While black cladding was noted as uncommon within the estate, its inclusion was deemed acceptable to break up the render and maintain visual balance.

The proposal was in accordance with relevant design policies and was not expected to harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or street scene. Members noted that the application complied with national and local planning policies, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Policy CS5: Design, Policy DC1: General Development, and the Middlesbrough Urban Design SPD (UDSPD).

Of 15 neighbour consultations, 11 responses were received, comprising 4 objections and 7 in support. Objections related to inaccuracies in the plans and references to white render rather than cream. Revised plans were submitted correcting directional labels and specifying cream render to match neighbouring dwellings. Some objectors expressed frustration with the consultation process; however, while letters were sent only to immediate neighbours, the process was open to all, and anyone could submit comments regardless of residence.

Members queried whether the proposed cladding would be painted and whether conditions could be imposed regarding this. The Officer advised that there was no existing condition to prevent painting, but an amendment to the recommendation could be proposed to include such a condition. It was noted that the cladding was plastic and therefore should not require painting, unlike timber cladding.

A further query was raised regarding whether planning permission was required for cladding, and the Officer confirmed that permission was necessary for alterations to the front of the property, including any material changes.

The Chair invited a resident to speak in support of the application, and the following key points were highlighted:

- The alterations were in accordance with both local and national planning policies.
- The amendments did not increase the building's footprint, ensuring the development would not dominate the street scene or adversely affect the character of the area.
- The use of high-quality materials, including cream render and modern fenestration, was consistent with contemporary design standards to modernise the property.
- Important architectural elements, such as the bay window, were retained and updated in a manner consistent with the design guidance set out in the Middlesbrough Urban Design SPD.
- While the black composite cladding was a modern addition, it served to break up what would otherwise have been a large expanse of render, contributing to a balanced and visually appealing frontage. The cream render aligned with finishes found on other properties in the estate.
- The alterations did not result in any loss of privacy or amenity for neighbouring properties. Side windows replaced existing ones and did not overlook primary windows of adjacent dwellings.
- Several neighbours had expressed support, highlighting the positive impact on the area's appearance, the desirability of modernisation, and the benefit to the community's long-term appeal.
- The work did not affect landscaping, trees, or access to the property.
- Other properties within the area had similar updates, which demonstrated that such changes were not out of character for the area.

Members sought clarification on how long the resident supporting the application had lived in the area, and it was confirmed that this had been 40 years.

It was also questioned whether the plans would result in the living room having more natural light, and it was confirmed that, whilst the resident could not speak on behalf of the applicants, a review of the plans indicated that this would be the case.

ORDERED that the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed within the report.

The Development Control Manager 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).

Agreed as follows:

- **Members noted the information presented.**

25/47

WEEKLY UPDATE LIST - APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Development Control Manager submitted details of new planning applications that had been received on a weekly basis over the past month. The purpose of this was to provide Members with the opportunity of viewing current live applications, which had yet to be considered by officers.

The Committee discussed the contents of the document. The Development Control Manager advised that if Members felt that an application ought to be considered by the Committee, he should be advised accordingly.

Members queried the parking provision resulting from planning application 25/0565/FUL, which concerned the erection of a coffee shop at Park Way Centre. It was advised that full details could be obtained from the case officer.

Agreed as follows:

- **Members noted the information provided.**

25/48

PLANNING APPEALS

The Development Control Manager provided an update on various Planning Appeals that had been considered by the Planning Inspectorate.

Members sought clarification in relation to the purpose of the planning application reference APP/W0734/W/25/3369616, and it was confirmed this was to connect to the electrical grid during the night and put it back into the grid during the daytime.

Agreed as follows:

- **Members noted the information provided.**

25/49

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

The Development Control Manager provided an update on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). It was noted that, since 2 April 2024, BNG had become a mandatory requirement for all major and minor planning applications in England, subject to certain exemptions. Developments were required to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value compared to the pre-development state.

Members noted that certain applications were exempt, including householder developments, de minimis cases (where less than 25 square metres of habitat was affected), and small-scale self-build projects. For applications subject to BNG, applicants were required to submit a statutory metric calculation tool and a scaled plan showing existing on-site habitat. Failure to provide this information could result in the application being invalidated.

It was highlighted that biodiversity value was measured in standardised units using a statutory metric, and developers could achieve BNG through on-site habitat creation, off-site measures, or, as a last resort, purchasing statutory biodiversity credits. The biodiversity gain hierarchy, which was avoid, minimise, restore, and offset was outlined as the required approach.

It was also noted that proposed habitats delivering biodiversity gain must be maintained for 30 years, and the Council could recover monitoring costs through legal agreements. Failure to meet BNG requirements or maintain approved habitats could result in enforcement action.

Agreed as follows:

- **Members noted the information provided.**

25/50

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

None.