

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

A meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held on 30 November 2018.

**PRESENT:** Councillors M Walters (Chair), S E Bloundele (Vice-Chair), D J Branson, J Hobson, J McGee, F McIntyre and V Walkington

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors D Davison and T Mawston

**OFFICERS:** P. Clarke, A. Glossop, G. Moore, B. Roberts and S. Thompson

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** Councillors L McGloin, J Rostron and N J Walker.

**DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

<b>Name of Member</b>	<b>Type of Interest</b>	<b>Item/Nature of Interest</b>
Councillor S Bloundele	Non Pecuniary	Agenda Item 4, Application No: 18/0549/FUL

**1 MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 5 OCTOBER 2018**

The minutes of the Planning and Development Committee meeting, held 5 October 2018, were taken as read and approved as a correct record.

**2 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 and the Development Control Manager 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:

**18/0616/OUT Outline planning application (with all matters reserved) for the erection of up to 350 dwellings at Land Off Alan Peacock Way, Prissick Base, Near Ladgate Lane/Marton Avenue, Middlesbrough for Regeneration**

The Development Control Manager 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 Development Control Manager reported that the application sought outline consent for the erection of up to 350 residential dwellings with all matters reserved. Members were advised that the application site was part brownfield site located in a mixed use area with residential to the west, James Cook University Hospital to the north with associated parking to the east, and Middlesbrough Sports Village to the east and south.

It was advised that part of the site was allocated for housing development within the Housing Local Plan. Members heard that the application was a departure from the local plan in that it proposed more dwellings on a larger site. However, it was highlighted that the increase in the size of the allocated site was proposed in the revised Development Plan, which was currently

at the publication stage.

Members were informed that the eastern part of the site was designated as Green Wedge and Primary Open Space and the south western part was designated as Secondary Open Space. The Head of Planning advised that the development would include a significant area of green/open space. The committee was advised that the development of the site for residential purposes, with areas of open space, was an opportunity to enhance the area and offer higher quality habitats.

In respect of highways, the Transport Development Engineer explained that an AIMSUN microsimulation model had been utilised to understand the potential cumulative highway impact of the housing numbers on the site being increased to 461 units. The exercise demonstrated that the adjacent local highway could accommodate the level of traffic generated by the proposed increased scale of development, without further highway capacity improvement works being required.

Members heard that the operation of the junction of Alan Peacock Way/Ladgate Lane in the future year scenarios, together with associated adjacent junctions, was assessed within the AIMSUN model and found to have no material impact on the operation of the adjacent highway network. In terms of geometric layout and highway capacity, Alan Peacock Way was therefore suitable to serve the level of proposed development.

Members were advised that matters of detail, such as - levels of car parking, the provision of footways/cycleways etc would be dealt with through the reserved matters process. Any scheme submitted would need to ensure that there were clear footways/cycleways links to existing infrastructure to the north and west. Possible links would also be sought to the south. The Transport Development Engineer informed Members that the links would provide good access to bus and rail services promoting the use of sustainable transport over cars. Given the nature and scale of development, the internal layouts would be designed and constructed to adoptable standards. Vehicular access to the proposed site was only to be taken from Alan Peacock Way.

The Head of Planning advised the committee that, as the site was owned jointly by the Council and Middlesbrough College, all contributions would be taken from the capital receipt in accordance with a memorandum of understanding signed by both parties. Details of potential financial contributions were outlined to the committee for Education (approx. £1m), Offsite Highway Works (approx. £1.6m) and Affordable Housing (approx. £2.6m).

Neighbourhood consultations had taken place and eight objections to the application had been received from seven properties. The Community Council and Ward Councillors had also submitted objections. No objections to the application were received from the statutory consultees.

A Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application raising mainly issues of traffic congestion and additional delays that the scheme would result in with the suggestion that the site should be developed after the 'Longlands to Ladgate' link road was provided.

A discussion ensued and concerns were raised in respect of the highway infrastructure and the level of traffic generated by the proposed increased scale of the development. The Transport Development Engineer responded to the issues raised.

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

**18/0337/COU Conversion to 3 flats (C3) with the first floor extension at rear and alterations to elevations at 136 Crescent Road, Middlesbrough, TS1 4QT for Mr Shy.**

The Development Control Manager 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 Development Control Manager informed Members that planning permission was sought to construct a two storey extension to the rear of the property and make internal alterations to create three self-contained flats.

The application site was a two storey, corner building located in a residential area close to Middlesbrough Town Centre. The property was originally used as a shop with flat above, this was subsequently converted to two separate flats. Plans originally submitted with the application indicated a full length extension to the rear and the property being converted into four self-contained flats. Following concerns raised by the case officer pertaining to the layout of the scheme and lack of amenity for future residents, the extension was reduced in length and one of the proposed flats removed from the proposal.

Members were advised that one of the flats fell short of the minimum standards for floor space, however, the layout plan provided with the application showed that there was sufficient space within the flat to provide furniture and retain adequate circulation space for future residents. It was explained that it would be difficult to justify a reason for refusal based on the lack of amenity given to the second bedroom as it would be used in a manner deemed appropriate by any future occupier.

In respect of parking space, there was a shortfall of two spaces, the proposal in place for an additional flat would result in a demand for one additional parking space. The Development Control Manager advised that a cycle parking facility would offset the under provision of parking to a certain extent and would encourage use of sustainable forms of transport. It was commented that an additional condition would be included to ensure the cycle parking facility was secure.

Neighbourhood consultations had taken place and one objection to the original scheme had been received. No objections to the application were received from the statutory consultees.

**ORDERED** that the application be **Approved on Condition** for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the inclusion of the following additional condition relating to the cycle parking facility:

Prior to occupation of the flatted development hereby approved, a covered, secure and lockable cycle store shall have been provided on site in accordance with details which have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved cycle store shall remain in perpetuity for the life of the premises.

Reason: In order to provide appropriate level of cycle parking for the proposed properties in accordance with general guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework

**18/0549/FUL Two storey extension to the rear at 1 Cambridge Avenue, Linthorpe, Middlesbrough, TS5 5HQ for Mr M Mousa**

At this point in the meeting Councillor Bloundele declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to the application and withdrew from the meeting.

The Development Control Manager 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 Development Control Manager explained that permission was sought for a two-storey extension to the rear. Members were informed that the initial scheme was subsequently amended to significantly reduce the scale of the extension. The development was considered

to be an appropriate design and scale of development that would not have a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties, the character and appearance of the Linthorpe Conservation area and highway safety.

Neighbourhood consultations had taken place and four objections were received to the initial design from the neighbouring properties. However, there had been no objections received to the revised plans submitted. No objections to the application were received from the statutory consultees.

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

**18/0631/FUL Two storey extension to the side and single storey extension to rear at 27 Green Lane, Middlesbrough, TS5 7SJ for Mr Aurangzeb**

The Development Control Manager 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 Development Control Manager informed the committee that planning permission was sought to construct a part single storey, part two storey extension to the side and rear. Members were advised that the main issues for consideration were the scale and design of the proposal, its impact on the character of the area and impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

Members heard that the proposal had been considered against local guidance and policy and it was considered that the scale and design of the front and side element of the extension was in keeping with the host property and would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area. The rear element of the proposal was considered to be piecemeal design but given its location, to the rear, would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the main streetscene and wider area, instead being a restricted impact.

The committee was advised that original plans submitted along with the application included a larger two storey extension to side and a single storey extension that extended to the rear boundary fence. Following concerns raised by the case officer in relation to the appearance of the extension the length of both the two storey element and single storey element was reduced. The proposal was now being considered was a part single storey, part two storey extension to the side and rear.

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

A discussion ensued regarding the scale of the development and how the rear element of the proposal would impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

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

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development would represent an over-development of the site as a result of its scale and the nature and proximity of surrounding development contrary to the requirements of Local Plan Policy DC1(d) and CS5.

3

**PLANNING APPEALS**

\*\* Councillor Bloundele returned to the meeting at this point.

The Development Control Manager informed the committee that three appeals had been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate against Middlesbrough Council's refusal to grant

planning permission.

**APP/W0734/D/18/3200232 - 4 Malvern Drive, Middlesbrough, TS5 8JB - Appeal Dismissed**

The development proposed was a two storey rear extension, single storey side/rear extension and porch to front.

The main issue was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

**APP/W0734/D/18/3205395 - 71 Clevegate, Nunthorpe, Middlesbrough, Cleveland, TS7 0LN - Appeal Dismissed**

The development proposed was described as front elevation bedroom extension above existing porch with pitched roof gable and internal ground floor alterations to provide a WC.

The main issue was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

**APP/W0734/W/18/3204756 - Land adjacent to the Red House Cottage, Church Lane, Nunthorpe, Middlesbrough, TS7 0PD - Appeal Dismissed**

The development proposed was 'Erection of a detached executive dwelling'.

The main issue was whether the appeal proposal would provide a suitable location for housing having regard to the accessibility of services and the character and appearance of the area.

Copies of the appeal decisions had been included in the agenda pack, for Members' information.

**NOTED**

4

**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).

**NOTED**