

This document was classified as: OFFICIAL

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held on Thursday 2 July 2026.

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

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: R Jameson, J Elder, M James and S Royal

OFFICERS: A Glossop, J McNally, S Thompson, P Wilson, K Allan and Burnham

26/1 **WELCOME, FIRE EVACUATION AND RECORDING OF MEETINGS**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised that normal rules of procedure applied and whilst Members of the public may be in attendance they would not be able to actively participate or comment on proceedings.

Introductions were made and the Fire Evacuation Procedure explained.

26/2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Name	Type of Declaration	Agenda Item
Councillor Ian Morrish	Non-Pecuniary	Agenda Item 6, Trustee of Nunthorpe & Marton Playing Fields Association
Councillor Joanne Rush	Non-Pecuniary	Agenda Item 6, Member of Nunthorpe & Marton Playing Fields Association and Chair of Nunthorpe Parish Council
Councillor Julia Rostron	Non-Pecuniary	Agenda Item 5, Ward Councillor of bordering Ward

26/3 **MINUTES - PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 9 APRIL 2026**

The minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 9 April 2026 were submitted and approved as a correct record.

26/4 **SCHEDULE OF REMAINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE**

The Development Control Manager presented the application, which had been deferred at the Planning and Development Committee meeting held on 9 April 2026 to allow further consideration of highway matters, alternative junction arrangements and additional engagement with local residents.

Members were advised that an update report had been circulated at the meeting setting out additional representations received since publication of the main report. The update report confirmed that one Ward Councillor had withdrawn their previous objection and adopted a neutral position following discussions regarding the proposed highway arrangements and enhancements to the Section 106 package. The update report also detailed a further objection from a Ward Councillor, additional comments from a local resident regarding delivery arrangements, eight new letters of support and thirteen representations reaffirming support for the development.

Members were also advised that the update report confirmed that a planning condition was proposed to restrict deliveries to between 8.00am and 10.00pm, with any breach being subject to enforcement action by the Local Planning Authority, and that officers remained of the view

Thursday 2nd July, 2026

that the application should be approved subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

Members discussed the application in detail, with particular reference to the proposed closure of Thackeray Grove and the potential impact on surrounding residential streets.

Members were advised that a number of alternative highway arrangements had been considered, including retaining the existing junction layout, mini-roundabouts, closure of The Prospect, one-way traffic arrangements and left-in/left-out access restrictions. It was explained that these options were not considered capable of adequately addressing the existing highway safety concerns or supporting improved pedestrian and cycle movements.

Members were informed that the Highway Authority remained satisfied that the proposed three-arm signalised junction, together with the closure of Thackeray Grove, represented the safest and most effective solution. The Committee noted that both the applicant's highways consultants and the Planning Inspector who considered the previous appeal had concluded that improvements to the junction were necessary.

Discussion took place regarding the proposed Section 106 Agreement, including funding for the monitoring of traffic movements and the introduction of additional highways measures which evidenced that traffic displacement was occurring on surrounding streets. Members were advised that the Section 106 Agreement had been enhanced to include funding for a potential point closure on Walton Avenue, a yellow box junction at Kingston Avenue/Green Lane and the extension of double yellow lines at Kingston Avenue, if required.

Members welcomed the improvements made to the design of the development compared with the previously refused scheme, including the revised siting of the building, additional landscaping and enhanced architectural detailing. Reference was also made to the benefits of redeveloping the vacant brownfield site, improving access to affordable food shopping and creating local employment opportunities.

The Chair invited comments and questions from the Committee.

In response to a Member querying how many representations in support of the application had been received, the Development Control Manager confirmed that 137 letters of support had been received from separate addresses.

A Member referred to the additional consultation responses and asked whether any objections had been received. The Officer advised that one Ward Councillor had withdrawn their objection and adopted a neutral position, eight additional letters of support and thirteen representations reaffirming support had been received, together with one further objection from a Ward Councillor.

Members queried whether Thackeray Grove was classified as a high-risk junction and whether its closure had previously been considered independently of the application. The Highway Officer advised that any highway improvement scheme outside of the planning process would be dependent upon the availability of funding and would be prioritised accordingly. He explained that the current proposal was linked to a development that would intensify activity at the site and therefore required mitigation of highway impacts.

Comments were made that whilst traffic levels on Green Lane could be heavy, they were not comparable to some of the Authorities busiest roads.

In response to a Member querying whether the existing junction met modern highway standards, The Highway Officer advised that the Highway Technical Statement confirmed that an offset crossroads arrangement of this nature would not be designed as part of a modern highway layout. He further noted that the previous Planning Inspector had considered the junction arrangements that had been presented as part of the appeal scheme and that it had not been the Inspector's role to devise alternative solutions.

Members referred to comments regarding increased traffic associated with the development and asked whether similar highway improvements would have been required had the site come forward for residential development. The Officer advised that any development proposal for the site would have triggered a review of the junction arrangement. He explained that highway

Thursday 2nd July, 2026

assessments were required to consider all vehicle movements as well as active travel requirements.

Members expressed the view that insufficient consideration had been given to the concerns of nearby residents and commented that, whilst the technical justification was understood, the proposals could have a significant impact on the surrounding residential area.

A Member referred to other junctions within the borough and questioned whether alternative solutions could have been implemented without the closure of Thackeray Grove. The Highway Officer advised that direct comparisons with other locations were difficult due to differing site characteristics. He explained that other junctions benefitted from additional highway land and turning space which were not available at Thackeray Grove. He further advised that modelling had demonstrated that the proposed three-arm junction would perform more effectively than a four-arm arrangement and would provide greater benefits for active travel.

A Member asked what evidence existed to demonstrate that the closure of Thackeray Grove would not result in unacceptable impacts on surrounding streets. The Highway Officer advised that the Section 106 Agreement would secure funding for monitoring and mitigation measures and that the closure would remove through traffic from the junction.

A Member sought confirmation that £28,000 had been allocated to fund potential mitigation measures. The Highway Officer confirmed that this was the case and advised that the funding was considered sufficient.

A Member sought clarification regarding the additional highway mitigation measures and whether they would be delivered as part of the development. The Officer advised that the three-arm junction, associated highway works, the closure of Thackeray Grove and the proposed box junction would be secured through a Section 278 Agreement and delivered by the developer in accordance with the Highway Authorities standards. He further advised that any extension to double yellow lines would be funded through the Section 106 Agreement and would be subject to consultation with local residents and Members.

The Chair invited residents to speak in objection to the application. The residents made the following points:

- It was stated that residents had attended a meeting with officers and highways representatives. The resident felt that proposals for yellow lines and a box junction had been presented as decisions rather than options and were not accepted by residents as mitigation for the proposed closure of Thackeray Grove.
- It was stated that Lidl had proposed a point closure which would only be implemented after the closure of Thackeray Grove. The resident expressed concern that no clear indication had been provided regarding the level of traffic problems that would trigger such a measure.
- Concern was raised regarding the proposed allocation of £28,000 towards traffic management measures. The resident contended that this could result in further road closures if traffic issues arose and expressed concern about potential queuing on Tollesby Road.
- The resident stated that correspondence and concerns submitted by local residents, including communications sent to Ward Councillors, had not been adequately addressed.
- It was stated that the area had a relatively low accident record, and the resident noted that this differed from comments suggesting the location posed a high risk.
- The resident referred to the Inspector's findings and stated that the development would contribute only a modest increase in traffic. The resident contended that signalisation of the Green Lane/Thackeray Grove junction had been identified as a preferable solution and that closure of Thackeray Grove had not been recommended.
- The resident suggested that the Lidl store could proceed with the installation of traffic signals while retaining access via Thackeray Grove.
- Concern was expressed regarding the potential impact of the development on nearby residents, including increased traffic, noise from servicing equipment and general disturbance.
- The resident stated that, in their experience, Lidl stores could generate significant traffic problems, even in locations with larger road networks and infrastructure. Concern was also expressed that delivery timescales and commitments made by Lidl were not always adhered to.

Thursday 2nd July, 2026

- It was argued that the proposal was inappropriate within a residential conservation area and that the site was not located within an established shopping precinct.
- The resident highlighted the predominantly residential character of the surrounding area, including Green Lane, St Mary's Walk and Church Lane.

*** At this point the meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes*

The meeting reconvened after 5 minutes, and the Chair invited the Ward Councillor to speak in objection to the application and raised the following points:

- They remained opposed to the proposed closure of Thackeray Grove and were not persuaded that the closure was necessary or represented the most appropriate solution for local residents
- Concerns were raised regarding the proposed yellow box junction at the intersection of Kingston Avenue and Green Lane. Whilst acknowledging that some form of traffic management may be required, they expressed the view that the proposal had not been fully evidenced and could create additional issues for residents and road users.
- The Ward Councillor referred to being a resident of Green Lane and highlighted the significant volume of traffic using the route, particularly during peak school travel times. The Ward Councillor stressed that the route was of importance as an access route to access local facilities and for emergency vehicles travelling to and from hospital.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the wider Green Lane Active Travel proposals. The Ward Councillor considered it important that the cumulative impacts of the Active Travel scheme, the Lidl development and proposed closure of Thackeray Grove were accessed collectively rather than in isolation.
- Whilst welcoming the regeneration of the former college site and its return to productive use, the Ward Councillor stated that they remained unconvinced that the proposed highway changes represented the most appropriate solution and therefore had reservations regarding the closure of Thackeray Grove and the associated traffic management measures.

The Chair invited questions and comments from the Committee.

A Member questioned whether the application site fell within a conservation area. The Planning Officer confirmed that the site was located outside of the conservation area.

A Member queried whether any traffic management had been introduced in connection with the nearby mosque development. It was advised that no specific arrangements had been implemented. Members heard that the mosque had been open for approximately 12 months and that discussions were continuing with the Ward Councillor regarding traffic-related matters. A second Ward Councillor was invited to speak in objection to the application, and the following concerns were raised:

- The Committee had heard differing views regarding noise impacts. The Ward Councillor advised that observations had been undertaken at the Lidl store in Stockton, including during delivery periods, and the level of disturbance suggested by objectors had been witnessed.
- Concerns were also raised regarding potential noise from refrigeration equipment and the impact of lighting on nearby residential properties.
- Concerns were expressed against the proposed height of the building and its proximity to neighbouring boundary fences. It was also suggested that the proposed tree planting could further reduce light levels in an area that was already perceived to have limited natural light.
- The Ward Councillor stated that consultation with local residents had been insufficient they referred to a meeting attended by a small number of residents and Councillor Henman and expressed the view that wider consultation had not taken place, with some residents only becoming aware of the application through the Council's website.
- Whilst acknowledging that Lidl was a good employer, the Ward Councillor expressed the view that the application represented development on the wrong site. Concerns were raised regarding pedestrian safety, particularly children, vehicle movements and the impact of the proposed closure of Thackeray Grove.

Thursday 2nd July, 2026

- The Ward Councillor raised active and sustainable travel within the application and questioned in reality how many people would access the store by bicycle,
- The Ward Councillor stated that the proposed development was not in the most appropriate location and could create difficulties for residents accessing their properties from Roman Road. Whilst acknowledging that junction improvements were necessary, she expressed the view that insufficient evidence had been presented as to why a four-arm signalised junction would not be a suitable alternative.

The Chair invited comments and questions from the Committee.

A Member queried the width of the proposed access and egress arrangements for heavy goods vehicles. It was confirmed that the access measured approximately 21 metres narrowing to 7.5 metres.

A Member acknowledged that a number of previously identified issues had been addressed but expressed the view that the siting of the building remained a concern. It was stated that, whilst the building had been moved slightly forward, its location remained broadly unchanged. Questions were raised over the buildings height on neighbouring properties and potential overshadowing.

Concerns remained regarding the perceived loss of light to neighbouring properties and it was advised that neighbouring gardens did not benefit from street lighting. Concerns were also raised over the long-term impact of the proposed landscaping.

A Member asked if the Ward Councillor whether they considered a Lidl store to be appropriate in the area. The Ward Councillor supported the principle of a Lidl store but considered the proposed site to be inappropriate due to its residential surroundings.

A Member sought clarification regarding the replacement of trees that had been removed. The Ward Councillor advised that it was their understanding that replacement planting would be required in accordance with relevant forestry requirements and would need to be of a level of certain maturity.

The Planning Agent for Lidl addressed the Committee in support of the application and highlighted the following points:

- Discussions had taken place with Planning and Highways Officers regarding a range of alternative options. Thanks were expressed to Councillor Henman and local residents engaging proactively throughout the process
- Lidl had agreed to a number of additional mitigation measures
- The existing junction was unsafe and concerns regarding its operation had also been identified by the Planning Inspector
- Lidl's highways consultants would not have designed or been able to secure approval for, the existing junction arrangement and that the proposed scheme would improve highway safety
- The proposed signalised junction was considered to provide significant safety improvements and enhanced traffic management
- A four-arm junction had been assessed and would have retained access via Thackeray Grove; however, traffic modelling had demonstrated that it would operate significantly above capacity
- The four-arm junction could not accommodate a dedicated right-turn lane into Thackeray Grove
- The closure of Thackeray Grove had been considered previously but had raised concerns about rat-running in the local area
- A four-arm junction arrangement would result in queuing traffic on Thackeray Grove
- The proposed three-arm junction would enable the junction to operate within its capacity
- Reference was made to comparison tables which demonstrated that queuing on all arms of the junction would be significantly reduced under the proposed arrangement
- Lidl had committed to funding the proposed box junction and point closure measures
- A park and stride initiative would encourage customers to use designated parking areas and reduce parking pressures on neighbouring streets
- Lidl generated traffic would have little impact during the morning peak periods, with the busiest trading periods expected during late afternoons and weekends

Thursday 2nd July, 2026

- The proposal supported active travel objectives and sought to reduce reliance on private car use
- It was reiterated that the proposed three-arm junction represented the safest and most efficient solution
- It was advised that the store would typically receive one and two deliveries per day restricted to daytime hours
- The Lidl store in Stockton operated under unrestricted delivery hours, which differed from the arrangements proposed for this store

The Chair invited comments and questions from the Committee.

A Member referred to concerns regarding noise and delivery arrangements and sought confirmation that deliveries would be restricted to the hours set out within the officer's report. The Planning Agent confirmed this was correct.

In response to a query regarding which Lidl store had been referred to in the discussion it was confirmed that it was Lidl on Yarm Lane in Stockton.

A Member sought reassurance regarding the replacement tree planting and whether the replacement trees would be of a suitable height. The Planning Agent advised he could not comment on the precise form of the trees but stated that significant work had been undertaken in developing the landscaping scheme and that the proposal included increased greenery around the carpark.

The Development Control Manager read an extract from the Planning Inspector's decision relating to the design of the Thackeray Grove junction. It was advised that the Inspector had stated that, had the development been acceptable in all other respects, the proposed junction works would have represented a necessary measure to reduce conflict between vehicles and improve traffic conditions, in accordance with Policies CS18 and CS19. The Development Control Manager further clarified that the Inspector's comments referred to the signalisation of the junction.

In response to a Member querying whether the Planning Inspector was independent, it was confirmed that they were a Government-appointed Planning Inspector and was entirely independent from the Local Authorities decision making.

A Member asked what sanctions would be available to the Council if deliveries took place outside the hours agreed within the planning permission and it was confirmed by the Development Control Manager that all planning conditions imposed on a permission were enforceable and that should a breach occur, the Council could serve a Breach of Condition Notice and noted that there was no right of appeal against such a notice.

A query was also raised querying whether Highways Officers had considered introducing a one-way system on Thackeray Grove, together with restrictions on right-turn movements from Roman Road. The Highway Officer confirmed that this option had been considered. However, he advised that a junction would still be required on Emerson Avenue to regulate vehicle movements and that the associated infrastructure requirements had formed part of the assessment of the option.

It was observed that over 1,100 people had been consulted on the application and that only a small proportion had responded.

Members noted that the application had been considered by the Committee on three occasions and acknowledged the strength of local feeling regarding the proposal. They commented that the scheme before Members differed significantly from the original submission, with amendments including a remodelled car park, additional work undertaken by Lidl, and engagement with local residents and the Highways Authority. Members expressed the view that there were insufficient planning grounds upon which to refuse the application and suggested that any refusal could be overturned by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal. They further noted that more representations had been received in support of the application than in objection.

In response to a query from a Member on whether people commenting to planning applications could be prevented from doing so if they did not reside within the affected area. It was confirmed

Thursday 2nd July, 2026

that there was no such restriction and that individuals were entitled to participate regardless of their place of residence.

Following debate, Members were satisfied that the application had addressed the principal concerns identified within the previous appeal decision and that the proposed development complied with the relevant planning policies, subject to the recommended conditions and completion of the Section 106 Agreement.

ORDERED that the application be **Approved with Conditions**, subject to the completion of the Section 106 Agreement.

*** At this point Councillor Rush left the meeting*

26/5

DECISIONS MADE UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

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**

26/6

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.

Agreed as follows:

- **Members noted the information provided**

26/7

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

None