



South Tyneside Council

item 2

Planning Committee Minutes

26 May 2026

Present: Councillors: Brown (Chair), Blair, Clifton, Ford, Medcalf, Oughton, Owens-Palmer, Rahman, Rice & H. Wildhirt

Also in Attendance:

Andrew Inch (Senior Manager Planning), Geoff Horsman (Team Manager - Development Management), Jaspreet Lyall (Planning Officer - Legal), Nick Graham (Planning Officer), Casey Scott (Planning Officer), Adam Williamson (Planning Officer), Karen Connolly (Democracy Officer) & Sean Allen (Democracy Support Officer).

19 members of the public and 1 member of the press was in attendance

1. Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made

2. Minutes

The Minutes of the 9 March 2026 & 16 March 2026 were agreed as a true record by the member who was present at those meetings.

Resolved: Minutes Agreed.

3. Planning Applications

Submitted: Report of the Director Place Strategy

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

- **260115 – 12 Surrey Street, Jarrow, NE32 5SB**
- **260079 – 7 Armstrong Terrace, South Shields, NE33 4LE**
- **260078 – 1 Pembroke Terrace, South Shields, NE33 4LG**
- **260104 – 88 Albert Road, Jarrow, NE32 5AG**

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

4. Schedule of Planning Appeals

Submitted: Report of the Director Place Strategy

The report contained a schedule of pending planning appeals and details the recent decisions.

An overview of the full list was provided to members. A member queried why the inspector would overturn a decision that was made using facts and information. It was noted that all applications are based on judgement based on planning rules. So the inspector will use their judgement but may give more weight to different issues.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

5. Chair's Urgent Items

The chair had no urgent items

APPENDIX 1

Application Number and Address: 260115 12 Surrey Street Jarrow NE32 5SB	Applicants: Mr Andrew Faber
Proposal: Change of use from Class C3 Dwelling House to Class C4 Six-Bedroom house in multiple occupation	
Declarations of Interest: None	
List of Speakers: Cllr G Kilgour – speaking against. Mr Kelly – speaking against. Mr Irwin-Rhodes – speaking against.	
<u>Decision:</u> Reject the application.	
Any Additional comments on Application A Site visit was conducted on the 22nd May 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. They noted that the online petition had 483 objections as of today. They also noted Councillor Jones had lodged an objection after the deadline, citing residential impact, local amenity, cumulative impact and risk of ASB in the area. Cllr G Kilgour spoke against the application. They noted concerns around the location and the nature of the application. the parking was noted as an issue, as the road all around was one way and double yellow on both sides of the road. There was not sufficient parking for a 6 bed HMO to be considered. They believed the floor design wasn't suitable and the residential amenity was an issue. They noted their concerns about no condition on same sex tenants which they felt were concerning. The area is a family area and the area doesn't need more 1/2 bed living spaces. They felt the issues outweighed any benefits. Mr Kelly spoke against the application, they noted they had lived on the street for 43 years, raising 2 generations of their family and using the park. They noted that parking was already an issue in the summer when the park was in use and that there had already been issues	

with work vans outside the property parking on double yellow lines. They noted that they had raised the issue to the council but nothing had happened. They were also concerned with the risk of Anti-Social Behaviour.

Mr Irwin-Rhodes spoke against the application noting 5 key objections to the application. the street is a quiet, settled street, not a high turnover street in terms of residents moving, which would happen with an HMO.

They noted the risk of personal safety, accessibility as well as potential anti social behaviour. They raised concerns with the parking and the issues with parking on double yellow lines. They noted noise issues and disruption to residential amenities and also noted the concern for vulnerable residents who lived next door and on the street, noting some are elderly or even bedbound and disruption from an HMO could have severe ramifications.

The officer noted that in respect of no condition on same sex tenants, this was not something that could be reasonable conditioned by the planning committee and would be for the landlord to make a decision on.

Members noted that article 4 and the voices of the residents couldn't be ignored and that an HMO would mean a significant change to the character of the area. They also raised concerns about the number of unregistered HMOs in the area.

Members noted that the issue always seemed to be developers making money rather than considering what was best for a potential tenant.

A member noted their concerns echoing what had previously been raised, as well as the planning history of the property where the developer had attempted to apply for an 8 bed HMO which was rejected, they noted that while the number of bedrooms had been decreased, the general concerns remained for the area. The back of the property backed onto an adjacent property, so not even a back lane would separate them and as that would be one of the very small areas they would be able to use, this could have an impact to more neighbours.

A member queried what was stopping multiple people living in each room, it was noted that a condition on the application would limit the number of people allowed to live in the property to 6.

The application was proposed to be refused by Cllr Owens-Palmer and seconded by Cllr P Ford. A vote was carried unanimously to reject the application for the following reasons:

1. The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) within an immediate locality that comprises predominantly single family dwellings would, as a consequence of the increased intensity of residential use and the associated increase in comings and goings that would arise, adversely impact on the character of the area and upon the 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 Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF.

2. The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) would, as a consequence of the increased intensity of residential use arising have an unacceptable impact in terms of car parking and associated residential amenity and highway safety given the increased pressure that would be placed upon on-street car parking in a locality where there is already heavy demand for such car parking, the increased likelihood of vehicle parking to the immediate front of the property where there are double yellow line parking restrictions and additional parking within a one-way gyratory highway system where such parking would result in obstruction of traffic using the nearside lane which is allocated for vehicles travelling north towards Jarrow town centre. 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: 260079 7 Armstrong Terrace South Shields NE33 4LE	Applicants: O'Brien/Nierbos 1 Ltd
Proposal: Change of use from ground floor dwelling to a 3 bedroom, 3 person HMO and amendments and insertion of windows and doors	
Declarations of Interest: None	
List of Speakers: None	
Decision: Reject the application.	
Any Additional comments on Application A site visit was conducted on the 22nd May 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. It was noted that the application and the next application were related as they were upstairs and downstairs of the same building, but were separate addresses and would be considered as separate applications. It was also noted that Councillor Sybenga had lodged objections based on over concentration in the area, residential and local amenity being impacted and highway issues. Members raised concerns that the shared yard would be a significant issue with the potential for 3 people in the downstairs and 5 in the upstairs having to share, should both applications be approved. A Member noted that it was difficult to separate the 2 applications when they were aware of the impact they could both have. It was also hard not to consider the risk of oversaturation which was already an issue. The parking appeared to be a concern as well as the residential amenity and impact to the character of the area. A Member raised an issue with the parking, noting that bollards had been placed outside the application property on the corner of Pembroke Terrace and Armstrong Terrace which indicated there had been parking issues previously. They also noted the oversaturation and negative impact to local and residential amenity.	

A Member noted that they had concerns about the proposal being considered in a vacuum and separate from the next item, due to it all being relevant. They raised concerns over the living space and the layout of the property to facilitate the HMO.

The application was proposed to be refused by Cllr H. Wildhirt and seconded by Cllr P Clifton. A vote was carried with 8 votes in favour and 1 votes against with the application refused for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) would, as a consequence of the increased intensity of residential use and the associated increase in comings and goings that would arise taken together with the cumulative effects of such HMO uses in the locality, adversely impact on the character of the area and upon the 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 Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF.

Application Number and Address: 260078 1 Pembroke Terrace South Shields NE33 4LG	Applicants: O'Brien/Nierbos 1 Ltd
Proposal: Change of use from first floor dwelling to a 5 bedroom, 5 person HMO and insertion of front and rear rooflights	
Declarations of Interest: None	
List of Speakers: None	
Decision: Reject the application.	
Any Additional comments on Application A site visit was conducted on the 22nd May 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. It was noted that the application and the next application were related as they were upstairs and downstairs of the same building, but were separate addresses and would be considered as separate applications. It was also noted that Councillor Sybenga & Councillor Diamond had lodged objections based on over concentration in the area, residential and local amenity being impacted and highway issues. Members noted their concerns connected to the previous agenda item within the ground floor of the building detailing the local amenity, residential amenity, parking and cumulative impact being the factors. A Member queried SPD6 and the requirements for parking. It was advised that there was no minimum standard for this, not a maximum, so nil was acceptable in this instance given the site circumstances. The application was proposed to be refused by Cllr Ford and seconded by Cllr Owens-Palmer. A vote was carried unanimously to reject the application for the following reason: The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) would, as a consequence of the increased intensity of residential use and the associated increase in comings and goings that would arise taken together with the cumulative effects of such HMO uses in the locality, adversely impact on the character of the area and upon the amenity of existing nearby occupiers and also have an	

unacceptable impact on car parking and associated highway safety given the increased pressure that would be placed upon on-street car parking in a locality where there is already heavy demand for such car parking and also bearing in mind the location of the site at a junction. 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: 260104 88 Albert Road Jarrow NE32 5AG	Applicants: Mr William Rowe
Proposal: Change of use from Class C3 Dwelling to Class C4 HMO – House in Multiple occupation (5 Persons)	
Declarations of Interest: None	
List of Speakers: None	
Decision: Reject the application.	
Any Additional comments on Application A Site visit was conducted on the 22nd May 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. It was also noted that Councillor A. Smith & Barr had lodged objections based on over concentration in the area, residential and local amenity being impacted and highway issues. A Member noted their concern about elderly resident properties close to the application address. They also raised concerns about the layout of the design, noting that 1 bedroom only had a toilet, no shower and the other had an off suite bathroom which could be seen as a risk for conflict between occupants A Member raised concerns about the layout of the cycle parking and bins. They also noted overall residential and local amenity concerns. The application was proposed to be refused by Cllr Ford and seconded by Cllr Owens-Palmer. A vote was carried unanimously to reject the application for the following reason: 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 on York Street to the south west of the application site, result in an adverse impact on the character of the area and upon the amenity of existing nearby occupiers. 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 Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF.	