



South Tyneside Council

item 2

Planning Committee Minutes

16 March 2026

Present: Councillors: S. Dean (Chair), Brenen, Davies, P. Dean, Ford, Hamilton, N. Maxwell & Welsh

Apologies: Councillors: Curtis, Keegan, Kennedy, McHugh, Owens-Palmer, Porthouse, Proudlock & T. Roberts.

Also in Attendance:

Geoff Horsman (Team Manager - Development Management), Andrew Inch (Senior Manager-Planning), Samantha Gallagher (Planning Officer), Emma Thomas (Planning Officer), Casey Scott (Planning Officer) John Rumney (Corporate Lead Legal and Governance and Deputy Monitoring Officer), & Sean Allen (Democracy Support Officer)

19 members of the public and 1 member of press were also in attendance.

1. Declarations of Interest

None

2. Planning Applications

Submitted: Report of the Director Place Strategy

The Committee considered the schedule of applications received for planning permission. It comprised the following:

- **250756 – 33 Coquet Street, Jarrow NE32 5SW**
- **260030 – 34 Alnwick Street, South Shields, NE34 0LB**
- **250777 – 2 Hunter Street, South Shields, NE33 3AH**
- **250784 – 110 Glen Street, Hebburn NE31 1NE**

Resolved: That the applications for planning permission be dealt with as outlined in Appendix 1 of these minutes.

3. Schedule of Planning Appeals

Submitted: Report of the Director Place Strategy

The report contained a schedule of pending planning appeals. The Officer provided the Committee with an update on each of the appeals in the schedule with particular emphasis on those cases where a decision had been made.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

4. Chair's Urgent Items

There were no chairs urgent items.

APPENDIX 1

Application Number and Address: 250756 33 Coquet Street Jarrow NE32 5SW	Applicants: Mr Guv Singh
Proposal: Change of use from C3 dwelling to C4 HMO (6 persons)	
Declarations of Interest: None	
List of Speakers: C Shepherd (Objector) P Shaw (Objector) VJ Spiller (Objector) K Gordon (Objector) J Woodhouse (Objector) Cllr G Kilgour (Objector) K Smith (Objector) D Newbrook (Objector)	
Decision: Planning permission refused	
Any Additional comments on Application A site visit was conducted on the 13th March 2026. The site visit was carried out with the prior approval of the Chair. The need for the site visit in advance was to view the site and consider the objections to the proposals. The Planning Officer delivered a presentation to the committee outlining the contents of the report including additional comments/information provided by residents after the publication of the committee agenda It was noted that at the date of the meeting, there had been 226 representations and a petition with 697 signatures against the proposed application. C Shepherd spoke in objection to the application, they noted they had organised the petition on the site. They were not against HMOs in general, but disagreed with the proposed site. They noted that residential amenity would be impacted and also raised a concern that the address was already being advertised online and was advertised for more that 6 which was being applied for. They noted ASB concerns and local impact to schools and sheltered housing. P Shaw spoke in objection to the application, they noted the street was a quite but busy family street with very little parking. They had already seen poor behaviours from the developer and had no confidence that it would lead to a well ran HMO.	

VJ Spiller spoke in objection to the application, they noted their family lived close to the application site. They felt the room sizes and application didn't fit the area and that the purpose of creating homes for young people was not a true representation and that it was just a profiteering exercise.

K Gordon spoke in objection to the application, they had already been dealing with the building that had been ongoing internally and noted that the work had been shoddy. The work had been leaving a significant mess in the back lane with no care for the residents. They raised concerns about elderly residents in the immediate area and the impact on the street.

J Woodhouse spoke in objection to the application, they noted the issues they had had with the work carried out and the back lane issues, they were concerned about the elderly in the area and the parking issue that was already on the street and would likely become worse.

Cllr G Kilgour spoke in objection to the application. In addition to expressing a number of concerns already made, they also raised concerns about the heights given for bedroom 6 which appeared to indicate the room level would be lower than permissible. They considered that the proposed rooflight did require planning permission and that Policy DM4 did apply in this case. They referred to the number of HMOs and local amenity impact and noted that residents should be listened to when the number of objections was so high.

K Smith spoke in objection to the application; they noted that their adjacent property had been damaged by the builders. They noted they didn't care and had been working on the site for 47 weeks with disturbances and poor workmanship with little care to rectify the damage done. They also noted the parking and concerns for elderly residents.

D Newbrook spoke in objection to the application, they spoke of the concerns for the residential amenity and the stress elderly people have had to endure. They noted that the parking on the street was a safety issue.

The Planning Officer addressed the neighbour concerns regarding the use of the building as an airbnb advising that this use would not require planning permission but if a material change of use is reported this could be investigated. The Planning Officer advised that Policy DM4 did not apply in this case as that policy only applies to larger HMOs.

A member spoke on their concerns about the lack of the developers communication and the damage that had occurred, they also stated that young professionals, who were the apparent target of HMOs generally drove, so parking was a concern.

A member noted they agreed they didn't think the site proposed was the right area for an HMO and agreed the concerns about residential amenity.

Members noted the significant number of objections was difficult to ignore and that the purpose of councillors was to serve the people by listening to them.

A member noted that had the proposed development been larger rooms and less planned tenants, it may have been something to consider, but that they couldn't consider the application appropriate.

A member noted that residential amenity, local impact and safety of vulnerable residents had to be the main factor in the decision.

Members discussed the potential reasons to refuse the application including the intensitivity of the use and the location of the site near to vulnerable residents in nearby bungalows, childrens home and sheltred accommodation.

Members concluded that the intense use would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the area and resdiential amenity if nearby occupiers. It was proposed by Cllr Ford and seconded by Cllr Brenen that the application be refused A vote was carried out with members voting unanimously in favour of refusing planning permission for the reasons below:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation would, as a consequence of the increased intensity of residential use that would arise in a location where there are vulnerable elderly residents occupying bungalows, a children's home and sheltered accommodation, result in significant adverse impacts on the character of the area and upon the residential amenity of existing nearby occupiers. All of the above harm would be contrary to Policy DM1 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework, Policy 16 of the South Tyneside Publication Draft Local Plan and Paragraphs 116 and 135(f) of the NPPF.

Application Number and Address: 260030 34 Alnwick Road South Shields, NE34 0LB	Applicants: Mr Yaz Akram
Proposal: Change of use from C3 dwellings to C4 House in Multiple Occupation [HMO] (5 persons)	
Declarations of Interest: None	
List of Speakers: D Hanson (Objector) H Donkin (Objector)	
Decision: Planning permission refused	
Any Additional comments on Application A site visit was conducted on the 13 th March 2026. The site visit was carried out with the prior approval of the Chair. The need for the site visit in advance was to view the site and consider the objections to the proposals. The Planning Officer delivered a presentation to the committee outlining the contents of the report.	

D Hanson spoke in objection to the application, they noted they lived next to the development and the lack of communication regarding work being carried out had been appalling. They noted the lack of care and the mess in the back lane which didn't give them confidence in the overall management of the house of multiple occupants. They noted the local residents accepted some properties were used for buy to let or Airbnb, but the conversion to an HMO was overkill.

H Donkin spoke in objection to the application; they noted multiple HMOs were in the area as well as recently rejected applications. They noted concern with the number across South Tyneside as well as the potential residents.

The officer noted that the application was to consider this building, and whilst weight can be given to the concentration of house of multiple occupants, the application was not for the wider borough and that the occupants were not a factor that could be considered. Within the officer's report they had considered concentration of house of multiple occupants within the immediate area.

A Member queried the number of bins that would be provided to properties as they were concerned about the potential overflow of rubbish. It was understood they would receive 2 of each bin (general and recycling). It was noted that this wouldn't be classed as a planning concern, only a planning condition was recommended with respect of bin storage, however members raised the point that the overall situation was a resident concern that couldn't be ignored when it was raised.

A Member noted that residential amenity and cumulative impact was a significant concern as was the ASB issued raised in the report.

It was proposed by Cllr Ford and seconded by Cllr Hamilton that the application be refused. A vote was carried out with members voting unanimously in favour of refusing planning permission, for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation would, as a result of the cumulative effects of such uses in the area, adversely impact on the character of the area and upon the amenity of existing occupiers, and have an unacceptable impact on parking and highway safety in the area, contrary to Policy DM1 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework, Policy 16 of the South Tyneside Publication draft Local Plan and Paragraphs 116 and 135(f) of the NPPF.

Application Number and Address:	Applicants:
250777	Kemela Livings Ltd
2 Hunter Street	
South Shields	
NE33 3AH	
Proposal: Change of use from C3 Dwelling to C4 HMO (6 persons)	
Declarations of Interest:	
None	
List of Speakers:	
J Crozier (Objector)	
D Appleton (Objector)	

P Lynn (Objector) – Statement read by Cllr P Brenen

Decision: Planning permission refused

Any Additional comments on Application

A site visit was conducted on the 13th March 2026. The site visit was carried out with the prior approval of the Chair. The need for the site visit in advance was to view the site and consider the objections to the proposals.

The Planning Officer delivered a presentation to the committee outlining the contents of the report.

J Crozier spoke in objection to the application; they spoke of their concerns on the parking in the area and how it could impact on adjacent roads that had commercial shops. They raised concerns on the number of HMOs in the area already and the fact they appeared to be 'shoehorning in' more bedrooms to maximise profit, rather than being concerned about the need for residential homes.

D Appleton spoke in objection to the application; they spoke of their concern about the location and subsequent ASB and parking concerns. They noted that there was a number of HMOs close by, including a potentially large one which would impact the area. They also noted their concern for the profiteering by adding more bedrooms than they should rather than a reduced number to make the living spaces a better quality and believed the applicant was morally bankrupt who wanted profit over resident homes.

Cllr P Brenen read a statement on behalf of P Lynn who was objecting to the application. It was noted that Cllr Brenen was not pre-determined in reading the statement. The statement raised concerns on the process for troublesome tenants and that the process to remove them would be left to the local residents to raise an issue, rather than proper management of the property. They were concerns about the parking impact and the general disturbance to the local community.

It was noted that the Highway Authority had not raised noted any objections and that the tenants would be handled by licencing as it wasn't a planning consideration.

A member raised concerns about rules around same sex occupants as they were concerned about the potential exploitation of vulnerable people or violence. It was noted that wouldn't be a planning consideration.

A member raised concerns about oversaturation of HMOs in the area as well as some that were potentially larger as well. This was also noted by other members as well as the size of the rooms and the parking issues. They were also concerned about impact on businesses in the adjacent street.

A member queried why the Highway Authority wouldn't object if there were such concerns. It was noted that the Highway Authority reviewed proposals based on the material impacts likely to arise.

It was proposed by Cllr Ford and seconded by Cllr Davies that the application be refused. A vote was carried out with members voting unanimously in favour of refusing planning permission for the following agreed reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation would, as a result of the cumulative effects of such uses in the area, adversely impact on the character of the area and upon the amenity of existing occupiers, and have an unacceptable impact on parking and highway safety in the area, contrary to Policy DM1 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework, Policy 16 of the South Tyneside Publication draft Local Plan and Paragraphs 116 and 135(f) of the NPPF.

Application Number and Address:

250784
110 Glen Street
Hebburn
NE31 1NE

Applicants:

Soyca Ltd

Proposal: Change of use from C3 Dwellings to C4 House in Multiple Occupation [HMO] (6 persons)

Declarations of Interest:

None

List of Speakers:

Decision: Planning permission refused

Any Additional comments on Application

A site visit was conducted on the 13th March 2026. The site visit was carried out with the prior approval of the Chair. The need for the site visit in advance was to view the site and consider the objections to the proposals.

The Planning Officer delivered a presentation to the committee outlining the contents of the report.

A Member queried if there was other development in the area, it was noted none were indicated.

A member raised concerns about the extra care opposite the site and the impact an HMO could have on residents once that site is built.

It was queried if the garage next door was a working business and if they had their own parking or could have overspill which would impact the parking outside this property. It was noted that the garage was an active business but held its own on site parking. It was noted the street was a main highway with very little parking.

It was proposed by Cllr Ford and seconded by Cllr Hamilton that the application be Rejected. A vote was carried out with members voting unanimously in favour of rejecting the application, for the following agreed reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation would result in an adverse impact on the character of the area and upon the residential amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy DM1 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework, Policy 16 of the South Tyneside Publication draft Local Plan and Paragraphs 116 and 135(f) of the NPPF.