

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

A meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held on Thursday 12 February 2026.

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

**PRESENT BY INVITATION:** Councillors D Davison, J Rush and M Smiles

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** A Bircham and D Lister

**OFFICERS:** S Bonner, A Burnham, A Glossop, R Harwood, S Pearman and S Thompson

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** None.

25/51 **WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

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

25/52 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<b>Name of Member</b>	<b>Type of Interest</b>	<b>Item/ Nature of Interest</b>
Cllr I Morrish	Non-Pecuniary	(Land at Nunthorpe Grange). Cllr Morrish declared he was a member of the Nunthorpe and Marton Playing Fields Association.

25/53 **MINUTES - PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 2 DECEMBER 2025**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held on 2 December 2025 were submitted and approved as a correct record.

25/54 **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.

**Item 1 – 2A Gypsy Lane, Middlesbrough, TS7 8NG**

The Development Control Manager presented an application that sought permission for the conversion of the property from a single residential dwellinghouse (C3) to three self-contained units (C3).

The application site was a two-storey, semi-detached residential dwellinghouse situated at the western end of Gypsy Lane, at its junction with Dixons Bank/Stokesley Road. It was within an established residential area with properties that were predominantly built in the 1950s and 1960s and arranged at a medium density.

The proposal involved the conversion of the existing dwellinghouse into three self-contained residential units, two of which would be created at ground-floor level and one at first-floor level. Although no extensions to the property were proposed, fenestration alterations were included to facilitate the development, such as the installation of double entrance doors within the vestibule, the blocking up of the rear door of the existing dwelling, and the addition of a new rear-elevation window to replace existing double doors. The site was proposed to be

landscaped, with dedicated external amenity areas provided for each of the three units, alongside a shared external amenity space. Three in-curtilage parking spaces, one for each unit, were proposed, with access retained from Gypsy Lane. A new small outbuilding was also proposed along the eastern boundary to accommodate cycle storage and general domestic items, positioned on the site of the existing detached garage, which would be demolished. The proposal was in accordance with relevant design policies and was not expected to harm the character or appearance of the dwelling, street scene or highways. 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).

Following the consultation period 17 responses were received, comprising 16 objections and 1 in support. Objections related to the proposal indicated that it was out of keeping with the established family character of the area; would set an unwelcome precedent for further flat or HMO conversions; would exacerbate existing parking, traffic and highway-safety issues, particularly for children using local school routes; would lead to increased noise, waste and pressure on local infrastructure; would harm residential amenity through overlooking and loss of privacy; and was associated with concerns regarding the poor condition of the property, the landlord's historic management of it, and the potential impact on community cohesion and property values.

Members discussed the possibility that residents in the flats could have more than one car. If this was the case could this be accommodated within the proposed scheme. It was clarified that additional car parking was possible within the curtilage of the scheme at a future date and that parking for visitors would likely follow the same pattern as normal houses, with visitors parking on the highway.

It was clarified there were no other single dwelling properties in the area that had been converted in the proposed way. It was also clarified that each application was considered on its merit and that each bedroom on the plans was essentially a single bedroom.

The Chair invited a resident to speak in objection to the application, but he was not present at the meeting.

The Chair invited Councillor Davidson to speak in objection to the proposal. As part of her presentation Councillor Davidson made the following points:

- Parking in the area was already difficult, and a double yellow line system was in place due to the proximity of Marton Shops.
- There was concern that if there was room for three cars for residents, more cars could be on site when visitors are taken into account.
- Street wardens were in the area on a regular basis.
- The proposed scheme was not with keeping with houses in the area.
- Lots of issues at shops with Anti-Social Behaviour and an increase in cars in this area may exacerbate this.
- The exist for deliveries at the shops was opposite the house which could cause problems.

Members queried if the Highways department had any objections to the scheme. It was clarified that the level of proposed parking was in alignment with the parking standards for such a use.

It was also clarified that parking around the shops was limited to two hours and that the proposed scheme may encourage others to park on the highway around the house which was already quite busy.

Members discussed the needs for accommodation for single occupancy dwellings and the need not to set precedence for this sort of scheme. At this point the Chair advised the committee the proposed scheme was not a Home of Multiple Occupation (HMO) and each application should be considered on its own merits.

Members further discussed the need for bungalows in the south of the town and how the proposed scheme could lead to increased parking demand in the area, highlighting that the accommodation could be occupied by up to 8 adults as it may not be single occupancy flats.

A motion to refuse was made and the member making that motion confirmed the basis of the motion as being the extent of use of the property would not be in keeping with the character of the area which was typically that of family homes.

**ORDERED** that the application be rejected, on the grounds the scheme was not in keeping with the surrounding area.

## **Item 2 - Land at Nunthorpe Grange, Nunthorpe Bypass, Middlesbrough, TS7 0NG**

The Development Control Manager presented an application which sought permission for the erection of 205 dwellings, with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure, on land at Nunthorpe Grange to the north-west of the A1043 (Nunthorpe Bypass), which formed part of the wider Nunthorpe Grange site.

The site was located to the north-west of the A1043 (Nunthorpe Bypass), approximately 150 metres north-east of the Poole Roundabout and comprised 15.8 hectares of greenfield land subdivided by hedgerows, extending from the A1043 up to Guisborough Road, which formed its northern boundary. Existing dwellings lay to the north and north-west, with the approved Persimmon housing development to the north-east, and the recently constructed medical centre and the community centre under construction to the west, separated by open space within the Nunthorpe Grange housing allocation. To the south, the A1043 separated the site from open fields and further residential properties.

The surrounding area primarily consisted of large detached two-storey dwellings, with bungalows and two-storey properties along the western boundary. The proposal comprised 205 dwellings, including 8 three-bed detached bungalows, 28 three-bed semi-detached dwellings, 22 four-bed semi-detached dwellings, 84 four-bed detached dwellings, 53 five-bed detached dwellings and 10 six-bed detached dwellings.

Supporting documentation submitted with the application included a Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement, Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, Transport Assessment, Heritage Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment, Air Quality Assessment, Ecological Appraisal, Contaminated Land Site Investigation and Sustainability Statement.

The proposal was in accordance with the requirements of the relevant national planning policies set out in the NPPF and Local Plan policies, specifically H1, H10, H11, H12, H29, H31, CS4, CS5 and DC1. It was also deemed to be in broad accordance with the relevant policies within the Publication Local Plan, which was afforded limited weight. Consultation letters had been sent to local residents, a press notice had been issued, and site notices had been displayed, with further re-consultation undertaken as amendments were made to the scheme. Following these exercises, objections were received from 73 properties, raising concerns regarding compliance with the Local Plan and emerging policies, housing density and design, the mix and size of dwellings, lack of affordable housing, highway safety, traffic generation, parking provision, pedestrian and cycle connectivity, local services and infrastructure capacity, flood risk, loss of green space and trees, environmental and visual impacts, inadequate play provision, impacts on residential amenity, and disruption during construction. Many respondents also expressed general opposition to further housing development and dissatisfaction with the consultation process.

The Chair invited comments from the committee.

A Member stated the site was identified for housing in the Local Plan and queried when this was created. It was clarified the Local Plan currently place was created in 2014. It was further clarified housing on the site to the extent proposed was permitted according to the Planning Inspectorate

A Member stated that larger homes seemed to outnumber smaller homes in the scheme. It was clarified the number of houses in the proposed scheme were three and four bed roomed, as permitted under planning policy.

A discussion took place regarding proposed access to the site. It was commented that current access would be a turnout, but permission was in place for a roundabout. Concern was expressed at traffic issues on the current bypass as the national speed limit was in place. As

part of the proposal a full feasibility study had been undertaken regarding access to the site and traffic matters.

It was clarified that a path listed in the proposal would connect to an existing right of way.

A discussion took place regarding the need for new homes to be within a certain distance of amenities, namely shops. It was clarified there was no planning requirement for this, only that connections to such amenities were needed.

Members expressed further concern about traffic matters, especially in relation to access to the site and that a scheme such as this would create increased traffic congestion and that people may park on the highway. It was clarified that each house on the site would have its own in curtilage parking provision.

Officers clarified that traffic considerations had been ran through a strategic development model. The development had been tested with the model. The modelling demonstrated that the proposed scheme would not have a material impact on existing traffic patterns. It was also stated that traffic had peaks and off-peaks and that while congestion was always possible, the main objective was to make sure the road network did not fail.

Members discussed the benefits of effective public transport links in this regard.

It was queried if the model accounted for developments in neighbouring authorities as these could impact on Middlesbrough developments. It was clarified that the model did take traffic from outside Middlesbrough into account but could not consider all other developments in neighbouring areas as there would be too many variables to consider. Members were also advised that the trip rate for the development was based on similar developments in the local area.

A discussion took place regarding available school places in relation to the proposed scheme. It was stated that S.106 agreements provided financial support to local primary and secondary schools for extra school places if necessary.

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

- Storey homes had worked with the Council to ensure it achieved all of the Council's requirements. Both parties considered the development would provide a good mix of housing. The development was sympathetic, and in line with the Nunthorpe design code. Storey Homes was a high-quality house builder, who ensured they exceeded expectations. This was demonstrated with a neighbouring development in Brookfield.
- The new homes would mean a contribution of £778,000 for additional school capacity.
- New homes reflect most recent changes to house building requirements. Tangible economic benefits would see increased Council Tax incomes as well as increased spend to the local economy.
- There were no material planning considerations that could deny the application.

A discussion took place during which it was clarified that any monies for school places would only be directed at schools in the Middlesbrough area and not neighbouring authority areas. It was confirmed that consultation with the adjacent authority had taken place in this regard.

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

- Chair of Nunthorpe Parish Council and author of the Nunthorpe Neighbourhood plan.
- Not opposed in principle but was concerned about compliance for example, bungalow provision was lacking, with policy requiring 10% while the proposed scheme only had 4%.
- Nunthorpe had a higher proportion of older residents, hence the pursuance of the bungalow provision.
- SUDs provision was not a village green, and the proposed scheme should not count the playing fields which were fenced off.
- Traffic in the area was already high.

- The speed restriction to the by-pass must happen.
- Local school provision was an issue, and this would put more pressure on the system.
- Not about stopping development, but more about ensuring what was promised in policy was delivered.
- S106 agreements should be discussed with the relevant community.
- Planning policy should be enforced. There was a lack of confidence in the planning policy.

A Member stated that, while he respected the views made those issues had been addressed in the report.

It was commented that SUDs design was subjective and that this should be a consideration as part of the design. It was also stated the nearby playing fields should not be part of the planned open space calculations.

The Chair invited Cllr Smiles as Ward Councillor to speak in objection to the application, and the following key points were highlighted:

- Nunthorpe residents did not want the proposed scheme to go ahead.
- Many residents felt the proposed scheme was inevitable, but the committee had power to prevent it going ahead.
- If the proposed scheme were accepted its size would change the character of the area.
- 73 people officially objected to the proposal. The feeling was more widespread than this.
- Not in character and increased traffic would be significant issue.
- Education and school placements would be put under pressure.
- Key point was pressure on existing infrastructure. There were existing problems on local roads and additional houses would put extra would pressure on this.
- Giving increased pedestrian access to the bypass was a serious concern.
- Health providers, such as GP practices and dentists would be put under pressure.
- Loss of green space would be lost, which was frequently used. This would also impact on the wildlife in the area.
- The scale of the proposed scheme exceeded the cap that was in the Local Plan.
- S106 agreements were not entirely effective, with the David Wilson development used as an example.
- Growth of the town was supported but questioned why Nunthorpe residents should bear that burden.

A discussion took place regarding access and existing permissions for access onto the bypass. It was clarified that existing permissions to the site were in place, as a roundabout for this current site, and, as a temporary access for the adjacent housing site, and that the adjacent site had been approved on appeal by governments Planning Inspector. The proposed junction for the scheme would go through a technical review. Traffic modelling had been done by the Council and in view of existing approvals, the principle of access onto the bypass had already been established.

The Chair invited Councillor Rush to speak in objection to the application, and the following key points were highlighted:

- Traffic was a significant issue, and the area was not public transport led.
- The area always suffered from significant traffic issues.
- In terms of education, there would be approximately 83 additional school children which taken with neighbouring developments would place education under pressure.
- S106 agreement was not a classroom.
- Local GPs were already under strain.
- Most people in the area would have to send children outside the area.
- Many residents wanted genuine single-story properties. The development did not include genuinely single-story housing. The housing mix was not suitable.
- The recreational land incorporated the SUDS and fenced off playing field areas and as such was misleading and not in keeping with planning policy.

- Playing land should not be built on, unless it met certain tests. The planning policy protections were not in place.
- On existing local development, issues around pooling water and provision of grit bins has been raised with developers, but no responsibility has been taken responsibility.
- Detailed scheduled maintenance should be provided as part of the proposed scheme.
- The proposed scheme was not sustainable; this would be over development.

It was clarified that access to the site was already approved from the by-pass. While the number of dwellings for the site was listed as 250 in the Local Plan, the Planning Inspectorate said that having a number cap within the Local Plan Policy was not in line with the NPPF and should therefore not be applied as a maximum. Officers clarified that there was an emerging policy regarding bungalows which had been challenged by developers so did not yet have full weight in decision making. There was no evidence to show that increased traffic activity could not be mitigated.

A Member commented that the concerns raised had been considered as part of the proposed scheme, it was stated that traffic mitigations would make little difference as the traffic issues were always present.

Members discussed the need for more effective bus network, but it was stated by Cllr Rush that people in the area would likely always use their car for travel and thereby contribute to additional traffic.

A discussion took place during which a Member stated that more bungalows were needed and needed to ensure the areas had 10% as a dwelling ratio and that the bypass needed a traffic light system.

A Member stated there was nothing of material planning consideration that would prevent approval of the proposed scheme. A motion was made and seconded for approval in line with the officer report. This was voted on and the vote failed, which included 2 abstentions.

As no decision had been made, a second motion was made for refusal of the application.

A discussion took place about the criteria to be used in rejecting the proposed scheme. Members were advised that should they refuse the application, definitive reasons would need to be provided in the event an appeal was made to the Planning Inspectorate.

It was resolved that criteria for refusal should be based on the lack of infrastructure including dentists, schools, doctors and shops, the lack of single storey bungalows, lack of education provision, the traffic impact and over development of the site.

It was reaffirmed by officers that, in terms of traffic impact the Council's modelling was carried out against national requirements and was evidence based.

It was also clarified that s106 monies for school places would be directed to Middlesbrough Schools rather than those in neighbouring authorities.

The second motion was seconded, and a vote took place. The motion failed.

A further discussion took place regarding whether bungalows could be built on the adjacent site. It was clarified that the site in question was in separate ownership and therefore could not be imposed on the proposed scheme. A member made a third motion, indicating that the additional discussion since the first motion had provided further information on certain matters. The motion made was to approve in line with officer's recommendations in the report. The motion was seconded, and a vote was taken.

**ORDERED** that the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed within the report and a section 106 agreement.

### **Item 3 - 19, Grange Crescent, Middlesbrough, TS7 8EA**

The Development Control Manager presented an application that sought permission for a porch to the front elevation, projecting 1.1m in length with a width of 2.9m and height of 3.1m.

The application property was located within an established residential area on the southern side of a road comprising predominantly two-storey semi-detached dwellings, set back within plots that reduced in size along Grange Crescent due to the curvature of the road. Further west, the street scene became more varied with the presence of single-storey dwellings of differing architectural styles, while to the south, on Boston Drive, properties were single-storey but of a more uniform design and plot size. The proposal involved the erection of a porch measuring 1.1 metres in length, 2.9 metres in width and 3.1 metres in height, constructed in red brick to match the existing dwelling with detailing to the archway and roof parapet, and incorporating a white uPVC door to the front elevation.

Policies CS5 and DC1 were identified as relevant, requiring high-quality design that integrated well with the surrounding context and minimised impacts on the character and amenity of nearby properties. Weight was also afforded to emerging policies within the Publication Local Plan, including Policies CR2 and CR3, which sought context-appropriate design and high-quality layout, form and materials. The Middlesbrough Urban Design SPD (2013) was a material consideration, setting out design principles for domestic extensions, including guidance on porches. The proposed porch marginally exceeded the SPD's footprint and height parameters but remained adequately set back from the highway and was considered subservient in scale. Its matching brickwork, parapet detailing and overall modest proportions were deemed sufficient to integrate with the host dwelling despite its flat-roof form, which the SPD generally discouraged. While the porch would be visible and would alter the uniform character of this part of Grange Crescent, its limited projection and high-quality design, together with permitted development fall-backs, were considered to mitigate any impact on the established building line and wider street scene.

Objections regarding character, street imbalance, and preservation of the estate's original appearance were acknowledged, but the proposal was judged not to result in harm significant enough to justify refusal. The porch was also considered acceptable in terms of neighbouring amenity, with no harmful overlooking, overshadowing or loss of privacy, and it raised no highway or parking concerns. Remaining objections relating to precedent, historic extensions, and party wall matters were not material to the planning assessment.

On balance, the proposal was considered to comply with Policies CS5, DC1 and the Middlesbrough Urban Design SPD, and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

Members queried if the property had undergone alterations prior to this application and if there had been other alterations to the frontages of similar properties in the area. It was clarified that from an officer perspective the proposed scheme was acceptable.

The Chair invited an agent Mr. A Bircham to speak in support of the application, and the following key points were highlighted:

- Was happy to answer questions from and thanked Planning officers for their work with the applicant in shaping the proposed scheme.
- While the scheme could have been deemed Permitted Development, the agent and applicant felt that, given the desired outcome to the scheme namely additional height, proper processes should be followed and therefore sought Planning approval.
- Objections received may have been extensions of existing neighbour disputes.

A Member queried why the proposed scheme had been submitted through planning processes when it could have been completed under Permitted Development. It was clarified because of the internal height of the flat roof meant it was the right thing to do in terms of materials etc.

The Chair invited a resident Mr D. Lister to speak in objection of the application, and the following key points were highlighted:

- Lived at the connecting property.
- All objectors in the area shared similar concerns.
- There were 34 semi-detached of this nature in the area and all were balanced to the left and right side
- The proposed scheme did not fit in with the local area and was not in line with the other houses in the area.

Mr Lister responded to questions from the committee during which it was clarified that the scheme, with minor alterations, could have been completed under Permitted Development.

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

25/55 **DECISIONS MADE UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

At this point in the meeting Cllrs Saunders and Wilson withdrew from the meeting.

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.**

A Member raised concerns regarding approvals and continuous use and requested that officers revisit the issue. Members were provided with an explanation regarding the timelines involved with continuous use and that the matter be discussed with Members before the next committee meeting.

25/56 **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.

A Member queried the status of property known to him to be listed. Officers explained this was still under consideration and that there were several factors surrounding this.

**Agreed as follows:**

- **Members noted the information provided.**

25/57 **PLANNING APPEALS**

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

**Agreed as follows:**

- **Members noted the information provided.**

25/58 **ANY OTHER URGENT ITEMS WHICH IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIR, MAY BE CONSIDERED.**

None.