

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday 10th June 2026.

Present: Cllr Mick Stoker (Chair),
Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Stephen Dodds, Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Elsi Hampton, Cllr Shakeel Hussain, Cllr Eileen Johnson, Cllr Paul Rowling (Sub for Cllr Michelle Bendelow), Cllr Andrew Sherris, Cllr Norma Stephenson OBE, Cllr Jim Taylor, Cllr Sally Ann Watson (Sub for Cllr Tony Riordan) and Cllr Barry Woodhouse

Officers: Julie Butcher, Sarah Garvin, Simon Grundy, Martin Parker, Joe Port and Sarah Whaley

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

Apologies: Cllr Michelle Bendelow (Vice-Chair), Cllr Tony Riordan and Cllr Sylvia Walmsley

P/10/26 Livestreaming

Due to technical difficulties the Chair announced that the meeting would not be Livestreamed.

P/11/26 Evacuation Procedure

The evacuation procedure was noted.

P/12/26 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Stephen Dodds declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in relation to item 25/0865/FUL 2 The Willows, Stockton-on-Tees, TS19 8BD as he was the applicant's agent. Cllr Dodds left the room and did not take part in the debate or voting thereon.

P/13/26 Planning Protocol

The planning protocol was noted.

P/14/26 25/2162/OUT Land North of Sandy Lane West, Billingham

Consideration was given to planning application 25/2162/OUT Land North of Sandy Lane West, Billingham.

Outline planning permission was sought, with all matters reserved except access, for the development of up to 179 residential dwellings (Use Class C3), together with a community building (Use Classes E/F2), and associated access, highways infrastructure, open space and landscaping.

The site lay outside the defined limits to development; however, the Council was unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. The proposal

had therefore been assessed having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with the decision hinging on the overall planning balance.

The application had generated a significant level of public interest, with 282 letters of objection received. The principal concerns related to highway safety and congestion, conflict with the Development Plan, and the potential impact on the separation between Billingham and Wolviston. These matters had been fully considered within the assessment. Technical consultees, including National Highways and the Council's Highway Authority, had raised no objection, and the submitted evidence demonstrated that impacts could be appropriately mitigated.

The proposal would deliver up to 179 dwellings, including policy-compliant affordable housing, making a significant contribution towards addressing the identified shortfall in housing land supply. This benefit was afforded substantial weight. The site was considered to represent a sustainable location on the edge of Billingham, with acceptable access to services, facilities and public transport. Other impacts, including landscape effects, loss of agricultural land, ecology, trees, drainage, heritage and residential amenity, had been assessed and were not considered to give rise to unacceptable harm.

Taking all matters into account, the adverse impacts identified were limited and did not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal when assessed in the overall planning balance. The development was therefore considered to represent a sustainable form of development.

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 report, the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the officers report.

The applicant and the applicants agent attended the meeting and were given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The applicant was a local builder in the Tees Valley and was committed to working with local employers, businesses and people who wanted to invest in the local area, offering affordable homes and employment opportunities.
- The applicant explained that he had listened to residents at the public consultation and had taken on board officers suggestions. The proposed application was compliant and provided connections to footpaths, a community hub as well as additional parking. The applicant also expressed his desire to deliver the scheme for the local community, delivering a sustainable development in a commercially sustainable manner whilst meeting current housing needs without compromise.

- The applicants agent endorsed the Planning Authorities recommendation for approval of the scheme.
- There had been no objections from statutory consultees.
- Speed cushions had been added to the entrance of the proposed development.
- The scheme met the Councils 20% affordable housing need.
- There would remain a gap of 260 metres between Billingham and Wolviston

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

- Concerns were raised relating to traffic on Thames and Whitehouse Road and the junction at Mill Lane which were already extremely busy particularly at school drop off and pick up times. There were already 2000 children crossing Thames Road daily and should the proposed development be approved, it would exacerbate the situation. Concerns were also raised relating to the toxicity of exhaust fumes particularly for children in pushchairs who were at exhaust level.
- Parking concerns were raised particularly along Sandy Lane West
- There had already been a traffic accident in the last couple of years which had resulted in a fatality. Multiple collisions involving motorists had been witnessed as well as police chases and a dog being hit and killed by a vehicle at Mill Lane and Thames junction. It was also stated that a couple on separate occasions had witnessed a child being knocked over, however because they weren't hurt seriously there was no report to refer to.
- The green space at Mill Lane had been used as green space by residents for many years, however if the development was to go ahead this would be lost.
- Concerns were raised relating to noise and light pollution.
- There were limited services available in the area, only 1 post office was in operation, and local shops were busy, parking overran and people already parked on paths in a traffic calmed area.
- Bus no.35 ran every half hour however stopped operating at 17:30 hours. The X40 and X41 did not link with railway services, the current infrastructure needed to be dealt with prior to bringing new residents to the proposed site.
- The number of residents recorded on the Planning Portal during the consultation period did not reflect the true number of residents opposed to the application. A community petition had been raised and over 500 residents had signed it opposing the proposed development.
- In terms of online consultation, it was felt that people without internet access had been omitted and not able to send in representation
- There was a lack of infrastructure such as GP's and Dentists, which should be invested in before new houses.

- It was felt the development would increase Anti-Social Behaviour.
- 3 proposed community units had changed from community use to commercial.
- The development was expected to last 4 years before completion therefore residents would be subject to noise and dust affecting their quality of lives for a long period.
- Members were asked to put safety, health and wellbeing first for the sake of residents before developments.
- Concerns around construction traffic were raised as residents were already experiencing problems when HGV and farm vehicles hit speed cushions so hard that residents' houses shook. Concerns were also raised from the noise generated by construction vehicles, and it was requested that fully assessed routes were established including times they could enter and leave the site before any planning approval.
- Members were invited to visit Ribble Close during the school run to witness traffic concerns for themselves.
- The Council already exceeded the 5-year housing supply, therefore this site was not needed and therefore the green field should remain.
- Wildlife needed protection.
- The Local Ward Councillor Marcus Vickers informed the Committee that he had been approached by many residents who were concerned about the development. This was a local developer who should be more aware and have a duty of care to local people in terms of the affect the proposed application would have on the community. The Council were in breach of many Local Plan policies. The Planning Committee should not be intimidated due to a lack of a 5-year housing supply.
- The Local Ward Councillor David Reynard referred to a presentation slide which showed multiple cars parked from the junction at Sandy Lane West and Mill Lane and stated that this was an enforcement issue which required funding to stop cars parking there. Cllr Reynard also highlighted that Anti-Social Behaviour was increasing in that area. There were traffic concerns at the Kings Arms pub Junction as this became gridlocked at 3pm for approximately 1 hour at Whitehouse Road.

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

- In terms of traffic congestion, the site had been assessed using industry software and if capacity issues were not identified using that software, then officers could not raise it as a capacity issue.
- There had been a number of accidents in the last 20 years on Thames Road including a serious case in 2023 where a child had walked between 2 parked cars. The rest of the accidents recorded were not considered serious, therefore the road could not be classed as unsafe. In terms of access to the site this was considered acceptable and a pedestrian crossing would mitigate the impact on the school run.

- The application site did sit outside the limits of development however officers needed to assess material plan considerations and as the Planning Authority could not demonstrate a 5-year housing supply the recommendation was for approval. There was also good access to local facilities which were in walking distance to the site which tipped the balance in favour of the development.

- Officers appreciated the loss of the green space however it was in a sustainable area. The site was not overly dense, was 10.67 hectares and there would be 18 dwellings per hectare, and Land Officers were satisfied that coalescence with Wolviston would be maintained.

- In terms of consultation, letters had been sent to those directly affected following the correct procedure. In terms of concerns regards online consultation, comments were also accepted in writing.

- Regarding construction traffic condition 21 had measures in place to ensure developers minimised impact on residents.

- Loss of property value was not a planning consideration.

- In terms of wildlife an ecological assessment had been carried out, and wildlife had a low ecological value.

- In terms of the impact on pollution and the air quality report which had been undertaken there was no adverse impact. Pollution levels were well below the national requirements.

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

- This was agricultural land and outside the limits of development and the 5-year housing supply was still under review.

- Concerns were raised around the site corridor linking conurbations. The noise mitigation strategy, particularly for those properties which were very close to the A19 brought into question impact on amenity for potential residents on the proposed site. The noise in the apex acoustic report was pretty severe, and the noise levels would impact neighbour's amenity when opening windows and or sitting in rear gardens, the cost of mitigation would be passed on to residents buying homes should it be required.

- Questions were raised relating to the old Landfill site.

- Why had Sport England's objections relating to noise been removed?

- Concerns were also raised relating to the Fire Authority's response to the consultation.

- What was the impact on the trees at the access point of the proposed site?

- Clarity was sought from the Principal Engineer for Highways as to what was meant by the traffic not being severe.

- Clarity was sought as to what powers the Council had to condition when and how often construction vehicles entered and left the proposed site.
- In terms of the 260-metre gap between Billingham and Wolviston, questions were raised asking what would stop that gap being built on and would the lack of a 5-year housing supply impact that.
- Officers were asked when the Construction Management Plan would be agreed.
- In terms of traffic modelling used, officers were asked if there was different traffic models used when calculating traffic flow etc near schools.
- The proposed application didn't feel like a natural fit design wise.
- There seemed to be a disconnect between the traffic modelling and reality which didn't offer any assurances.
- Whitehouse Road was dangerous and concerns were raised regards traffic safety in and around Northfield School, particularly relating to irresponsible parking.
- The infrastructure was not there to support this development.

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

- Regards impact on amenity due to noise disturbance this had been considered in detail.
- Sport England's objection related to the noise from the use of a MUGA and playing field and the impact the noise would have on future residents; however, the applicant had since provided additional information, Environmental Health had referred this back to Sport England who were now satisfied.
- The site layout had yet to be determined at the reserved matters stage, although officers were satisfied the site could accommodate 179 houses without impact of noise on neighbouring and future occupiers or from the sport project.
- Officers confirmed that there were trees and hedgerows on the boundary of the site which were categorised as b and c. There would be limited removal of low value trees to achieve the access to the site.
- The Fire Authority would be consulted again at Reserved Matters stage.
- The Council did not have a 5-year housing supply hence why the application was acceptable
- A noise report was submitted from the A19 which showed dominant noise. A further noise report had been requested which would then allow officers to look at appropriate mitigation and address any amenity issues once that report had been received. Only a small number of plots would be affected by noise in gardens. The main aim was to allow windows to be opened but this needed further assessment.

- Regarding the concerns relating to landfill, this was a historical landfill site which was 250 metres Northeast of the application site. The last infill was in the 1980's therefore further information had been requested.
- The Principal Engineer for Highways explained that regarding concerns relating to whether traffic was severe, the NPPF stated it was either severe or it was not, there was no sliding scale. For this application all junctions assessed only had negligible delays.
- Officers confirmed that condition 21 detailed within the main report-controlled construction vehicles, working hours, dust routes etc. which was enforceable
- In terms of the lack of a 5-year housing supply and the threat to coalescence, officers explained that each housing application was judged on its own merits and if a development did come forward the impact would be assessed based on that application. Officers were satisfied the proposed application would maintain the gap and if an application was submitted it would be assessed and if the gap was not satisfactory officers would resist.
- Then Construction Management Plan would be part of the reserved matters stage, the developer would have to satisfy the Council and agree the finer details at that stage of the planning process.
- Officers explained that there was different traffic models used, for example there was a large model for Yarm, Wynyard and West Stockton, however there was no model for the proposed location and therefore basic industry assessment was used when looking at capacity and the impact of the proposed development on that capacity at junctions. None of the junctions around the proposed development site showed significant capacity issues.

A vote took place and the application was refused.

RESOLVED that planning application 25/2162/OUT Land North of Sandy Lane West, Billingham be refused for the reasons as detailed below:

1. Character and identity

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development is outside the defined settlement limits and would erode the existing separation between the settlements of Billingham and Wolviston. This would result in the visual coalescence of those settlements and result in an unacceptable impact on the individual character and distinctiveness of Billingham and Wolviston, contrary to Policies SD3, SD5 and SD8 and paragraphs 135 and 187 NPPF.

2. Impact on amenity – Traffic noise and disturbance

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development by virtue of its proximity to the A19, would result in significant noise and disturbance due to the associated vehicle movements and traffic noise, adversely impacting on future residents levels of amenity and resulting in lower standards than would reasonably be

expected, contrary to Policy SD8 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Sustainable development

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would not represent sustainable development under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with paragraph 11(d,ii) of the framework, the associated benefits of the proposals would not be outweighed by the limited contribution to housing supply and the resultant harm to; the character of the open countryside; loss of agricultural land; biodiversity due to loss of trees/hedgerows; and the adverse impacts of traffic on the local highway network, contrary to policies SD3 (3&4), SD8 (1&2), TI1(6&12) and ENV5(1) of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework 110, 116, 129.135 and 187.

P/15/26 25/1945/FUL 74A Darlington Road, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 5ET

Consideration was given to planning application 25/1945/FUL 74A Darlington Road, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 5ET.

The application site related to a detached residential dwelling located within the limits to development and within Stockton-on-Tees.

Planning permission was being sought to raise the ridge height of part of the dwelling to enable a loft conversion with rooflights, to include the installation of cladding, the erection of a single storey infill extension to include canopy to the front and erection of a 1.8m high boundary wall/fence to the front.

A total of 21no objections had been received by members of the public. No objections had been received by technical consultees. In accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation, the application was to be decided by Members of the Committee as more than 5 responses had been received by members of the public to the application following consultation and publicity.

Several concerns had been raised by members of the public; however, the main concerns related to the impact on the character and appearance of the area, the impact on the setting of Hartburn Conservation Area and the impact on the amenity of surrounding neighbouring occupiers which were addressed within the report. Other concerns raised had also been addressed within the report.

During the application process, the proposed extensions had been amended significantly due to character and amenity concerns. The amended plans had resulted in the reduction in scale of the extensions, which previously appeared as a two-storey extension, and had now been reduced to appear as 1.5 storey. It was considered that this design change would mitigate both character and appearance impacts, and overshadowing and overbearing impacts for surrounding neighbouring occupiers. In addition, overlooking of the neighbouring properties had been addressed through further amendments to the submitted plans by proposing to install rooflights to the principal elevation roof slope. The base of each rooflight would be 1.9 metres above the internal finished floor level which was considered to suitably mitigate the potential overlooking of the neighbouring dwelling to the north of the application site.

Overall, it was considered that the proposed development had been made acceptable through amendments in terms of its appearance and its impact on neighbouring

occupiers. It was considered that the proposals were in general accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan policies and therefore the recommendation was to approve the application subject to the conditions set out in 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 assessment contained within the 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 main report.

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

- 1 resident explained that they would have to live with the consequences of the increased roof height and roof lights which would be overbearing. The applicant had originally proposed obscure glazing to the garage roof lights however was now proposing a film which could peel off.
- Concerns were raised relating to a lack of privacy on neighbouring properties. The 1.9 metre windowsill height did not prevent overlooking.
- A tree with a Tree preservation Order (TPO) had been felled without permission.
- Councillor Niall Inness made representation on behalf of a resident who would be affected by the proposal should it be approved. The application was overbearing and out of character in the conservation area of Hartburn.
- Had the historic buildings officer visited the site as they still had not responded to the consultation therefore how could it be recommended for approval.
- There were several bats which flew over the property; therefore, it was felt a bat survey was required.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The applicant had listened to residents' concerns and had made big changes to the proposal.

- The property sat well back from the main road and needed modernising.
- There was a mix of houses and styles in the area.
- The scheme was acceptable in terms of amenity, and the scheme had reduced the 1st floor level as well as dormer windows at the front of the property.
- The scheme accorded with the Councils guidance.
- Separation distances had been exceeded.

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

- There was a 14 metre separation distance and through further revisions a reduction in the height of the ridge and eaves.
- Impact regards amenity to the neighbouring property was acceptable.
- Regards the tree that had been felled this was being looked at with a possibility of taking action. A replacement tree notice was likely to be produced
- There was no requirement for obscure glass due to the changes made to the height of the Velux Window which was now 1.9 metres.

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

- The property was right next to the conservation area in Hartburn and Velux Windows were not permitted in a conservation area. The property was surrounded on all 4 sides by other properties. Overshadowing was a concern.
- Officers were asked if they were satisfied with the separation distances from no. 74a and 72 as it looked below 13 metres.
- There appeared to be a lot of overlooking and shadowing.
- There would be adverse impact on amenity for 74 and 72 due to loss of light from the gable end.

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

- The proposed property was right next to the conservation area however was not in the conservation therefore Velux Windows were permitted
- Officers confirmed that in relation to no.72 officers were happy with impact of the rooflights and the height of the rear elevation. In terms of 74a officers were happy with the rear elevation and the separation distances also.
- Members were informed that you would have to be taller than 6ft 2in to see out of the Velux Windows as the bottom of the windows were 6ft 2in and angled backwards.

- Officers explained the original scheme would have been overbearing however the improved scheme was considered acceptable

A vote took place and the application was refused.

RESOLVED that planning application 25/1945/FUL 74A Darlington Road, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 5ET be refused for the reasons as detailed below:

Impact on the Amenity of the Occupiers of No.74 Darlington Road

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, it is considered that the proposed increased ridge height and associated additional scale and massing, would have an overbearing and overshadowing impact on the occupiers of No.74 Darlington Road contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Local Plan Policies SD3 and SD8 and Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Design Guidance

P/16/26 25/0865/FUL 2 The Willows, Stockton-on-Tees, TS19 8BD

Consideration was given to planning application 25/0865/FUL 2 The Willows, Stockton-on-Tees, TS19 8BD.

Since the writing of the original report, amendments to the submitted drawings were sought to alter the shape of the roof of the proposed single storey flat roof rear extension to become a pitched roof, as per Members decision at the March 2026 planning committee meeting.

The requested changes were made to the applicant's planning agent, however, instead they have sought to address the matters in an alternative manner, by removing the Juliet balcony to the first-floor rear elevation and replacing it with a fixed window.

Due to the narrow remit of the decision at March 2026 planning committee meeting, the application was being brought before Members for decision on the revised details.

Further consultation with neighbouring residents had taken place, and at the time of writing, 4no objections comments from 3no households had been received. Overall, the further comments made by neighbours were not considered to alter the original recommendation of Approval with Conditions for the application.

Overall, whilst the proposed design choice was not what was recommended by Members, the amendments to the plans, along with the recommended conditions, were considered to suitably mitigate the previous concerns raised in relation to the flat roof potentially being used as a balcony and affecting neighbouring occupiers' amenity.

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 acceptability of the proposed plans and planning mechanisms in place, the application was recommended for approval with conditions as detailed within the main report.

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

- Concerns were raised relating to the proposed height of the property as this had now become a 2-storey property with a wrap around extension and did not fit in with the character of the area.
- At a previous planning committee meeting held on 4 March the Planning Committee approved the application with a condition that a low-pitched roof replace the original flat roof, however the new changes meant the roof could potentially be used as a terrace. Had the low-pitched roof been proposed then this would have provided robust mitigation against the roof being used as a terrace as well as overlooking and would have been a permanent safeguard.
- The Committee should hold up the previous decision they made in March 2026.

The applicant's agent was in attendance and given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The proposed balcony was originally a Juliette balcony and had been replaced by a fixed window which would not provide access to the roof as the glass would be fixed.
- The application had been ongoing for 14 months. This was a basic application and all the points needed to be taken into account and the decision based on planning law.
- Separation distances had been met

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

- The existing property had a Velux Rooflight and dormer.
- In terms of the property being out of character, there was no definitive types of houses in the area.

The proposed fixed window could not be changed and there were satisfactory controls in place to stop the flat roof being used as a terrace.

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

- Clarity was sought regarding separation distances.
- There had been concerns raised at the March meeting regarding the impact of the development regarding building materials being left at the access and concerns

relating to how untidy the site was and what the Council could do about it to ensure the construction site was tidy and safe.

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

- Officers informed the Committee that separation distances were achieved.
- In terms of the site being untidy officers explained that the project was too small to condition construction activity.

A vote took place and the planning application was approved.

RESOLVED That planning application 25/0865/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives;

01 Time Limit

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

02 Approved Plans

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

Plan Reference Number	Date Received
4000- 25 - 101 F	7 April 2026
4000- 25 - 102 C	16 October 2025
4000- 25 - 100 B	1 May 2025

03 External Finishing Materials

The external finishing materials proposed shall be in accordance with the details contained within the submitted application form and thereafter retained for the lifetime of the development.

04 Tree Protection Plan

The scheme for the protection of trees on site shall be carried out in accordance with the details on approved plan 4000- 25 - 102 C submitted on 16 October 2025.

05 Boundary Treatment

The approved boundary treatment plan shall be in accordance with the submitted plan 4000-25 - 102 C received on 16 October 2025 and shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

06 Obscure Glazing

Notwithstanding the submitted drawings, the window on the south-western facing principal elevation at first floor serving an en-suite of the development hereby approved, shall be fitted with obscure glazing to at least obscuration factor 4. This window shall be maintained as such and be retained for the lifetime of the development.

07 Balcony/Raised terrace

The roof of the approved single storey flat roof extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden, terrace or other external amenity space at any time.

No balustrade, railing, access door other means of access to the roof shall be installed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.