

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday 10th December 2025.

Present: Cllr Mick Stoker (Chair),
Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Robert Cook (Sub for Cllr Michelle Bendelow), Cllr John Coulson (Sub for Cllr Elsi Hampton), Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Shakeel Hussain, Cllr Mohammed Mazi (Sub for Cllr Dan Fagan), Cllr Tony Riordan, Cllr Andrew Sherris, Cllr Norma Stephenson OBE, Cllr Jim Taylor, Cllr Sylvia Walmsley and Cllr Barry Woodhouse

Officers: Elaine Atkinson, Julie Butcher, Jill Conroy, Stephen Donaghy, Simon Grundy, Martin Parker and Sarah Whaley

Also in attendance: Applicants, Agents and Members of the Public

Apologies: Cllr Michelle Bendelow (Vice-Chair), Cllr Dan Fagan, Cllr Elsi Hampton and Cllr Eileen Johnson

P/43/25 Evacuation Procedure

The evacuation procedure was noted.

P/44/25 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

P/45/25 Minutes of the meeting which was held on 5 November 2025

AGREED that the Planning Committee minutes from the meeting held on 5 November be approved and signed as a correct record by the Chair.

P/46/25 Planning Protocol

The Chair agreed to vary the order of the agenda to take item 8 (5 year Housing Supply) first as the housing supply was relevant for other items on the agenda

The Planning Protocol was noted.

P/47/25 5 year supply of housing land update

A member of the public made a request to speak on this item.

A motion was moved and seconded that the member of the public be given the opportunity to address the Committee.

A vote took place, and the motion was carried.

The member of the public made points relating to housing allocations, masterplans and bypass roads.

Members were asked to consider and note a report detailing the Housing Supply and Delivery: Annual Position Statement 2025/26 to 2029/30.

Following on from the November planning committee meeting, the report provided members with further explanation of the process and how information was considered when formulating the annual position statement on housing land supply.

For clarity the NPPF required Council's to update their position annually, with this year's assessment being based on 1st April 2025 to 31st March 2030. As previously reported, in December 2024 Government updated the methodology for calculating the Local Housing Need.

The report also included the following:

- Site delivery information
- 5 November 2025 Planning Committee report
- Annual position statement report 2025/26 - 2029/30
- Large sites within the housing supply
- Small sites within the housing supply
- Demolition and losses

Further clarification had been provided in relation to 5-year supply and overall availability as detailed in paragraph 3 of the officers report and how the NPPF should be interpreted at part a and part b.

Members attention was drawn to Appendix 1 category B sites which highlighted sites that had been excluded from the 5 year supply and reasons why.

The main topics discussed were as follows:

- Concerns around the Land at Low Lane / Little Maltby Farm, which was an approved application and was not considered deliverable within the next 5-year period, however the Land South of Manor Close, Wolviston was considered deliverable and had not yet been approved. The Committee were informed that there was no current progress/information around prospective developers for the Land at Low Lane / Little Maltby Farm, therefore officers had exercised caution as the development may not come forward.
- Brief discussion was had around Mount Leven Farm, Leven Bank Road, Yarm and the reasons why this was not included in the 5-year supply of housing even though it had been approved in 2013. Officers explained that the permitted scheme was implemented but unlikely to build out. Planning permission for an alternative scheme was refused and an appeal dismissed. It was therefore considered that the permitted scheme would not be delivered within five years.
- Questions were raised relating to demolitions and losses and why this was still counted in the 5-year supply of housing. Officers informed Members that when each demolition occurred this was then taken out of the 5-year housing supply.
- Members questioned the accuracy of the remaining houses to be delivered within the updated 5-year period particularly those at Land East of Yarm Back Lane (Persimmon Homes & Taylor Wimpey Plots) as Persimmon Homes had not responded to officers'

requests to update their figures of what they expected to deliver in the updated 5-year period. Members were informed that officers asked developers for their updated figures, however where developers did not respond officers would take their last delivery, look at various data, assessing and critiquing the information and use a database to calculate future delivery which could be relied on.

- Discussions were had relating to the Local Plan. Members were informed that the Local Plan was currently being updated and once this was ready discussions would then take place.

AGREED the report be noted.

P/48/25 25/1607/FUL Arlington Park Sports Centre, Adderley Street, Stockton-on-Tees

Consideration was given to planning application 25/1607/FUL Arlington Park Sports Centre, Adderley Street, Stockton-on-Tees

Planning permission was sought for the provision of a new Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) to include the installation of floodlighting, associated enclosure and footpaths.

No letters of objection had been received following neighbour consultations. No objections had been raised by statutory consultees.

The application site related to the development of designated playing fields; however, it was for the provision of improved sporting facilities thereby drawing support from Local Plan Policies.

The application had been assessed in full, and it was considered that the development would not result in any significant conflict with the policies of the Local Plan or relevant chapters of the NPPF and there were no technical reasons why the proposed scheme would be deemed unacceptable in planning terms in which to justify refusal of the application.

In accordance with the Councils scheme of delegation, the application was to be determined by Planning Committee as the application was a Local Authority development with a total site area of over 500 square metres.

The consultees that had been notified and the comments that had been received were detailed within the main report.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded in view of the assessment contained within the main report, it was considered that the proposed development would not result in any significant conflict with the policies contained within the Stockton on Tees Local Plan or the relevant chapters of the NPPF and there were no technical reasons why the proposed scheme would be deemed unacceptable.

In planning terms, the proposed development was considered acceptable in all other regards and was therefore recommended for approval subject to those planning conditions set out within the officers' report.

Members welcomed the application. The new proposed facilities would replace the current old, outdated facilities and it would be a great asset to the community.

A vote took place, and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 25/1607/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions;

Time Limit

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Approved Plans

02 The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s);

Plan Reference Number	Date Received
23-0106 01	01 August 2025
23-0106 03P V2	26 November 2025
23-0106 04	01 August 2025
HLS8264 – Page 1	01 August 2025
HLS8264 – Page 2	01 August 2025

Opening Hours

03 The development hereby permitted shall not operate outside of the hours of 08:00-21:00 (Monday – Sunday inclusive), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

External Lighting

04 The external lighting shall operate in accordance with the details contained within the submitted Design and Access Statement and approved plans, reference HLS8264 – Page 1 and HLS8264 – Page 2, dated 01 August 2025 and shall operate only between the hours of 08:00 and 21:00 Monday-Sunday, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved lighting scheme shall be implemented in full and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details. No additional external lighting shall be installed without prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority.

Construction Hours

05 In undertaking the development that is hereby approved:

No external construction works, works of demolition, deliveries, external running of plant and equipment shall take place other than between the hours of 0800 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0900 to 1300 on Saturday.

No internal works audible outside the site boundary shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 0800 to 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0900 to 1300 on Saturday.

No construction works or works of demolition whatsoever, including deliveries, external running of plant and equipment, internal works whether audible or not outside the site boundary, shall take place on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays.

For the purposes of this condition, construction works are defined as: The carrying out of any building, civil engineering or engineering construction work involving the use of plant and machinery including hand tools.

Informative Reason for Planning Approval

Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems arising in dealing with the planning application by gaining additional information required to assess the scheme and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

P/49/25 25/1514/OUT Land South Of Manor Close, Wolviston, TS22 5QA

Consideration was given to planning application 25/1514/OUT Land South Of Manor Close, Wolviston, TS22 5QA.

Outline Planning permission was sought for the erection of up to 11 no self-build plots with all matters reserved except access.

The application site was outwith the development limits; however, the Council could not demonstrate a five-year supply of housing and therefore the benefits of the scheme had been weighed against the harm as detailed within the report.

The development had received several objections which had been considered in full and there were no sustainable planning reasons to refuse the development.

The proposal was considered to be acceptable in planning terms in all other regards and was recommended for approval subject to those conditions as detailed within the report.

The consultees that had been notified and the comments that had been received were detailed within the main report.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that in view of the considerations set out within the officers' report, the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

The Applicants Agent attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- This was an outline planning application for up to 11 self-build properties with access to the proposed site.

- There had been no objections from regulatory authorities / external consultees.
- In terms of design, this would be considered at the reserved matters stage.
- As the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing, the decision to be made should be judged on the guidance contained within the NPPF and Local Strategic Housing Plan.
- After discussions with Highways, appropriate and safe access could be taken from Manor Close without impacting local amenity
- The proposed application would deliver sustainable housing, contributing to the 5-year housing supply and an affordable housing contribution would be made. There would also be an increase in the local economy from additional residents on the proposed site.

The Applicant attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The applicant explained that he had owned the proposed application site for 27 years and had been approached many times by prospective buyers to buy the land and develop their own homes. There was a clear demand for this type of development, and the site was in easy reach of local amenity. On the southern and eastern boundaries there were Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) in place which provided a clear definition between Wolviston and Billingham. The applicant felt the development would enhance and benefit the village of Wolviston.

Objectors attended the meeting and were given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- Clarity was sought as to whether a recently installed dropped kerb at the proposed access to the application site had received planning permission and questions were also raised as to whether the removal of the gates at the site was a criminal offence. It was also stated that residents and the Parish Council had not been consulted over the installation of the dropped kerb or removal of the gates.
- No.8 Manor Close would suffer the most from traffic entering and exiting the proposed site during construction and once occupied.
- Due to the Councils Local Plan being out of date, it was felt that a decision should not be made until the Local Plan had been reviewed.
- If new developments were required in the village then alternative land was available which would not impact local amenity in the way the proposed application did.
- Green wedge was being eroded.
- A recent resident to Wolviston felt as though residents didn't really have a say particularly due to a lack of a 5-year housing supply, it was also suggested that terminology needed to be explained better for residents to better understand the complex planning process.

- A request was made that should the application be approved then vegetation screening should be provided.
- Houses were not in short supply in the village.
- There were no guarantees as to what would be built and when.
- The village would not be able to stand heavy construction, therefore another route for construction traffic was requested, including avoiding school drop off and pick up times.
- There would be extended periods of construction causing access issues to those residents on Manor Close as well as to new occupants whilst waiting for the remaining house to be built.
- The development would impact the character of the area.
- Concerns were raised relating to increased traffic at Manor Close as well as in and around the village posing a risk of harm to pedestrians.
- A site visit was requested so Members could appreciate the narrow road and sharp bend to the entrance of Manor Close.
- There would be increased pressure on local infrastructure should the development be approved.
- Reference was made to Tees Archaeology's response following consultation and their recommendation that a condition be included at the outline planning stage, however there were no details of the condition within the report
- A resident informed the Committee that he had contacted the Planning Service in 2024 as there were bags of building material on the proposed site, however he was informed that no hard standing could be put on the site as it was considered to be agricultural land, therefore questions were raised as to what had changed since then.
- The proposed application would not fix the lack of a 5-year housing supply in Stockton.
- This was the wrong housing in the wrong place on green wedge with poor access.
- This site had a well-documented history of planning refusals by Stockton Borough Council.
- The site would impact visual amenity due to back gardens being readily visible from the road.
- Should the application be approved, this would more than double the number of properties accessing Manor Close.
- Self-Build properties would cause longer disruption during construction for neighbouring residents.

- It was highlighted that an eight-foot strip of land at the southern boundary of Manor Close was alleged to be in the ownership of existing properties, forming a ransom strip that included the proposed point of access.

Ward Councillor Marcus Vickers for Billingham West & Wolviston attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. His comments could be summarised as follows:

- Residents had been in contact raising concerns over the harm, access and resident wellbeing should the development go ahead.
- There had been previous developments proposed on brown field sites with cul-de-sac access which had been refused.
- The land was not part of the Local Plan and if planning permission was granted this would be a starting gun for future developments on green sites across the Borough.
- Developing on agricultural land would be a breach of Council policy
- The nearby Miller Development (which this application made reference to) and the proposed development would both cause significant risk of coalescing the village of Wolviston to the town of Billingham.
- Due to the nature of Self-Builds, there were genuine concerns that what was agreed today may change in design by the actual builder/developer, as well as a substantial end date to the development taking place with self-build mortgages/finance usually difficult to obtain.
- In terms of Biodiversity net gain, the net gains the development was proposing, were sadly gained off-site, and more should be done to encourage biodiversity within the existing footprint.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- In terms of the removal of the gate and dropped kerb at the proposed access point, this did not need planning permission.
- The principle of development and details of how the lack of 5-year housing supply affected the application was detailed within the officers' report.
- The land was not green wedge.
- Trees and hedges would be kept on the site.
- Where objectors had mentioned an alternative site north of Wolviston, that could not be given any weight as that was not the application Members were being asked to consider.
- There was to be up to 11 homes maximum, and there would be a phased Construction Management Plan (CMP) for each development.

- In terms of visual Implications/character of the area, full details were contained within the report.
- There was no evidence to suggest that there would be any pressure on local services such as NHS, schools etc.
- The road to access the site via Manor Close had been confirmed by the Highways Manager to be wide enough for traffic to pass through and had been measured at 4.8 metres wide.
- The Miller Homes application which had been referred to had not yet been submitted.
- The remaining gap between Wolviston and Billingham would not lead to coalescence.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions / make comments. These could be summarised as follows:

- Due to the number of objections relating to the access from Manor Close questions were raised as to why this could not be moved to Wolviston Close and pedestrian access coming off Manor Close?
- It was felt the access road would not service construction vehicles and there would be a lot of disruption for those residents who already resided in Manor Close as well as future occupants in the new homes whilst the remainder were being built.
- The proposed development would result in a significant increase in construction vehicle movements for a prolonged period of time, due to the self-build nature of the scheme, thereby adversely impacting on the amenity of the existing residents.
- Clarity was sought as to whether a traffic survey had been undertaken.
- The proposed development would have an adverse impact on pedestrian and highway safety due to the lack of footpaths and increase in vehicle movements.
- It was suggested that there should be footpaths on both sides of the entrance to Manor Close for pedestrian safety.
- Clarity was sought as to who owned the ransom strip of land.
- Questions were raised relating to how the development could contribute to the 5-year housing supply if individuals had not yet been identified to build the houses.
- Reference was made to Cleveland Fire Brigades comments requiring access to residents drives if a fire needed to be extinguished, meaning people would need to move cars to allow access.
- Officers were asked to clarify if the number of properties could change.
- Residents should be consulted over the Construction Management Plan.

- Clarity was sought as to the white line which was shown on the presentation slides at the entrance of Manor Close
- There was clearly archaeology on the application site which was important as it could possibly be a medieval village.
- Brief discussion was had around flooding and that any flooding on the entrance to Manor Close was not acceptable.
- Questions were asked relating to affordable housing and where these would be?
- Officers were asked to explain the consultation process with the NHS and whether a response had been received from the local GP surgery.
- Clarity was sought as to whether officers had asked the applicant to look at other possible sites for the development.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- In terms of access from Manor Close, officers explained that the main road had been looked at as an alternative for access however the central reservation would need to be moved, and a significant number of trees would need to be removed. The proposed access from Manor Close accorded with highway design.
- The Principal Engineer, Highways, confirmed that due to the small number of proposed homes a traffic survey was not required.
- In terms of the impact on residents from construction traffic, it was highlighted that 4 houses on Manor Close had been extended and there was no evidence to demonstrate that that had caused any issues.
- Officers informed the Committee that where questions had been raised relating to land ownership, officers had looked at this with legal and highways. The road had been adopted, and any covenants were a civil matter. The land appeared to be owned by the applicant and there was no evidence that there were other owners..
- Regarding the 5-year housing supply, it was explained that officers needed to balance the harm against the benefits. Officers also explained they had a register of potential individuals who were looking for self-build opportunities.
- Where comments had been made relating to Cleveland Fire Brigades submission and the possibility of needing to access private drives in the case of a fire emergency, it was explained that this was a standard response, the layout plan was indicative at this time and would be looked at further at the reserved matters stage.
- Officers confirmed that the maximum number of properties was 11.
- It was highlighted there was a condition regarding flood risk, and the flood authority had confirmed the entrance to Manor Close would not flood.
- There would be a sustainable drainage scheme.

- If the Construction Management Plan was not adhered to it could be enforced
- The white line was to help warn and encourage drivers to avoid hitting the wall at the entrance to Manor Close.
- In terms of archaeology a condition had been applied.
- Due to the nature of the site affordable housing would not be supplied at the application site.
- Consultation had taken place with the NHS who had responded on behalf of local GP surgeries. In terms of consultation re school places this was done internally, and capacity had been confirmed.
- The applicant had not been encouraged to look at other sites as he had brought the application site forward as he owned the land, and it was a small development. Officers were of the opinion that this did not conflict with policy.

A vote took place, and the application was refused.

RESOLVED that application 25/1514/OUT Land South Of Manor Close, Wolviston, TS22 5QA be refused for the reasons as detailed below;

1. In the opinion of the local planning authority the proposed development would result in a significant increase in construction vehicle movements for a prolonged period of time, due to the self build nature of the scheme, thereby adversely impacting on the amenity of the existing residents through additional vehicle noise and general disturbance, contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SD8(e) of the Adopted Local Plan.
2. In the opinion of the local planning authority the proposed development will have an adverse impact on pedestrian and highway safety due to the lack of footpaths and increase in vehicle movements contrary to Policy SD8(f) of the Adopted Local Plan and Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework

P/50/25 Appeals

The Appeals were noted.