



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 16th December 2021

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th August 2021 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Harness (in the Chair)

Councillors Beasant, Batson, Croft, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Mickleburgh, Parkinson, Pettigrew and Silvester.

Officers in attendance:

- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Highway and Transport Planner)
- Richard Limmer (Major Projects Planner)
- Bev O'Brien (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Property Lawyer)

Also in attendance:

- Councillor Philip Jackson – Waltham Ward Councillor
- Councillor Hayden Dawkins – Humberston/New Waltham Ward Councillor
- Councillor Linda Mumby – Waltham Parish Councillor

There were 5 members of the public and 1 member of the press present at the meeting.

P.17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology of absence was received from Councillor Goodwin for this meeting.

P.18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mickleburgh declared a prejudicial interest in P.19 – Item 2 as he had publicly made his views known on this application.

P.19 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

The committee considered a report from the Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Resources regarding deposited plans and applications.

RESOLVED – That the deposited plans and applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act (Serial No's 1 – 6) be dealt with as set out below and detailed in the attached appendix.

Item One - DM/0418/21/FUL - Land at Station Road/Louth Road, New Waltham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought consent for the erection of Extra Care Development (Use Class C2) with associated communal facilities, access, parking, landscaping and associated works. Specifically, it was to erect a 58 unit extra care apartments on the corner of Louth Road and Station Road in New Waltham. Internally the residential accommodation would be in the form of small apartments, on the ground floor there would be 14 units. On the first floor there would be 21 units, this would be reflected again up onto the second floor. The accommodation would also comprise of communal and staff facilities on the ground floor such as stores, lounges/bistro, kitchen, office, guest suite, refuse store, laundry, scooter store, toilets and staff room. Mr Dixon added that an additional condition would be included to secure that the extra care units would only be occupied by persons 60 years old or over, a partner of, or somebody surviving, persons of 60 years of age or over, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Mr Dixon stated that the proposal was for a much-needed extra care accommodation within the area. The proposal was of good design and responded to local context and constraints. The relationship with neighbours was considered to be reasonable and matters such as highways and parking had been satisfactorily addressed. Subject to conditions securing final details and arrangements, development would accord with policies set out in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021. It was therefore recommended for approval.

Ms Debbie Humes spoke on behalf of the applicant. She explained that recent planning guidance stressed the importance of providing extra care accommodation to the elderly. Extra care addresses housing needs for the elderly housing situation, locally and nationally. Initially the applicant worked through pros and cons with the planning officer to address any issues that may arise. They identified a local need for high quality extra care accommodation and the allocated residential site was an appropriate location for extra care. 58 apartments would be implemented for the frail elderly. The accommodation would allow individuals to maintain some form of independence using the facilities on site. There would also be communal gardens and extra care gave individuals the opportunity to buy in care packages to suit their individual needs. Their services would employ seventeen workers and there would be 24 hour staff care on site. The applicants had researched the need for a site like this in New Waltham and results had shown that there was a need for one. This development would have significant social economic and environmental benefits to the

area. It would be a high-quality and a highly sustainable development that met policy aspirations. The development would allow people to carry on living in the local area. This would result in large family housing being freed up, but still allowing the elderly to be part of the local community. The properties would not have any adverse impact to the street scene or traffic. Ms Humes stated how it was important to support health care and competition to business close by. Extra care would create 17 new jobs and would result in a considerable investment in the site. It would have a positive economic impact and provide specialist retirement services, which would contribute to older people not feeling like they're getting old. She hoped Members would endorse the recommendation and approve the application.

The Chair explained that the application was in his ward, so he knew the area well. He stated that it was a busy corner for a care home and wondered about visual aspect of such a large building close to the boundary. He also wondered whether the evacuation process had been considered as there may be a few issues with it being a three-storey building with the elderly living there.

Mr Dixon explained that it was an allocated site for housing, it was a leading care home developer who had chosen to use this site and officers felt it was appropriate. It would allow residents to be integrated within the community which would be one of its attractions. In terms of evacuation plans, this would be covered under building regulations to make sure the building was compliant.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that the site had already been approved for housing and he believed the proposal for a mixed development was great. He liked that there would be a contrast and it would aid society. As the community gets older there would be a need for smaller accommodation. It would help keep people out of care homes and still allow them to have a level of independence. His concerns were that not a lot of people would be able to afford this sort of proposal, but that wasn't a planning matter. He thought it was a great proposal and commended the applicant for putting something like this together. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hudson stated that this was a site that Members never wanted to see a development on, which the Committee originally turned down. However, the inspector found that it was suitable and resulted in the borough gaining a lot of housing on this site. However, he thought this proposal was an improvement to the 400 houses they were going to get. This would make the corner stand out. He stated that a lot of thought had gone into this design, and he thought the three-storey design was positive. He seconded the application to be approved.

Councillor Parkinson thought the speaker gave more empathy around the elderly and not planning matters. He stated that Councillor Hudson had said everything he wanted to say. However, he would have preferred a

two-storey building as he believed it would be bulky and high massing on the corner.

Mr Dixon added that the proposal would go through building control to make sure it was suitable.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions listed within the attached appendix and the additional condition mentioned above.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved.)

Councillor Mickleburgh left the meeting at this point.

Item Two - DM/0419/21/FUL - Land at Station Road/Louth Road, New Waltham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought erection of a 66 bed Nursing Care Home with associated communal facilities, access, parking, landscaping and associated works. The building would have a curved shaped plan form and would be a mixture of single, two and three storeys in height. It would measure 12 metres in height at its tallest point and 8.7 metres to eaves. The building would have tiled pitched roofs. The proposal was of good design and responded to local context and constraints. The relationship with neighbours was considered to be reasonable and matters such as highways and parking had been satisfactorily addressed. Subject to conditions securing final details and arrangements, development would accord with policies set out in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) and the NPPF 2021. It was therefore recommended for approval.

Ms Debbie Humes spoke on behalf of the applicant. She explained how this application would address the need for elderly care home facilities. It would create a high-quality living setting for elderly residents in New Waltham. The agent and applicant had worked positively with officers to address any issues that may arise. This was an appropriate site for this type of development. She explained how the need for care was expected to double over the years. The service would be provided by an award-winning care home provider that specialised in dementia and the proposed application had been designed carefully with those needs in mind. It would incorporate ample community space, ample outdoor space and numerous terraces. All parts were wheelchair accessible, and a large part of the designs were due to careful planning and the setting up of a dementia care unit, using specific colour schemes, nurses stations etc. Residents would be accompanied at all times. Ms Humes wanted members to recognise the importance of York Care choosing to invest in this site. They were very highly specialised and achieved two CQC outstanding ratings. Lindsey Hall was currently at full occupancy, along with a long waiting list. This area had been identified as being in need for something like this and would be well set up with local transport. She added that the application complied

with planning policy and would promote a wider benefit to the Borough. The care home would provide 60 local jobs and have a positive economic impact.

Councillor Hudson thought it would complete the site and he moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe believed it tied in well with the other building. He seconded the application to be approved.

Councillor Pettigrew thought it would be a welcome addition to the area and a good asset to the local community. The design would complement the corner, he believed it would look quite decent and be an asset to the village.

Councillor Parkinson thought the design was interesting. He stated that it was a well-regarded operator.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions listed within the attached appendix.

(Note - the committee voted eight for, none against with one abstention, in favour of this application being approved.)

Councillor Mickleburgh returned to the meeting at this point.

Item Three - DM/0466/21/FUL - 238A Station Road, New Waltham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought retrospective change of use from garage to hair salon and creation of pedestrian access with the installation of fence and gate. Mr Dixon stated that it was not unusual to have a small scale hair salon in residential areas to facilitate working from home. There were no impacts on the character of the area or neighbouring amenity and there were no negative impacts on the highway network. The fence proposed was also considered acceptable. The application was considered to be in accordance with Policy 5, 22 and 23 and was recommended for approval for a temporary period of 1 year.

Mrs Anderson spoke as an objector to the application. She explained that since the salon opened it had already had a detrimental impact on her husband and herself. Cars and customers were continuously accessing part of their drive. They knew it would be shared access, but they did not know it would be for business use and for customers. She stated that they had no legal right to cross. Since they use the drive to access by car, the foundations were not great when it was rainy and windy. In the winter she explained how it would be a lot worse. The application stated how clients would arrive on foot. She did not think this was a realistic long-term solution and neither would clients being able to park at the Farmhouse Pub 250 yards away. Alternative parking on Station Road was also

dangerous. Local residents needed the road to be clear for good visibility. Clients didn't tend to leave for long periods. Parking in neighbouring streets was inconvenient to local businesses and in terms of the restrictions being put in place, who would police them? Mrs Anderson explained that they seem to do a 10-hour day but had stated they only had six clients each day for two hairdressers. Giving them these hours could see the services, if in demand, being increased. She appealed to members to refuse the retrospective planning application.

Mrs Roz Keyworth spoke on behalf of the applicant. She explained that the change of use from a garage to salon was due to the applicants' disabilities. They understood the dismay of neighbours, but Mrs Cochrane could not stand for long hours so she needed a salon to be designed in a specific way as well as working hours being extended. Careful consideration had been taken in terms of road and traffic. Mrs Keyworth explained that the applicant did have a large family so the objector may have misinterpreted that it was clients visiting. She explained that the applicant was only able to see six clients a day due to her disabilities. Parking had been organised with the pub, which she explained would be more than adequate as there would only be one client at a time. She stated that no highways issues would be created, and anticipated work would be outside school hours.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that there had been various objections and he had taken a lot of care to look at the objections raised. The temporary one year approval would give members an idea on whether this application was reasonable. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal. He did not like retrospective applications but understood that the applicant had got the business up and running first. He also understood concerns of neighbours and how it may be confusing knowing whether it was family or clients visiting. He commented on how the salon was being ran by someone with a disability and believed they should be encouraged to succeed. As it was only going to be for a year's approval, he believed they would have the opportunity to see whether any issues develop.

Councillor Hudson stated that when he originally looked at the application it seemed innocent. However, when he put himself in the neighbour's position, particularly when sharing a drive, he understood the frustration. If it wasn't for the shared drive, he would have no hesitation to approve.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that whatever was put into place, it did not remove the fact that a business was coming into a residential area. He felt for the neighbours as it would not have been something they expected. He was a bit dubious about the proposal for parking in the pub and wondered whether it was something that would be adhered to. He explained that hours were 10am – 8pm one day so he corrected the speaker on when they said it did not cross school times.

The Chair believed that people would park on the road. He was dubious about the separate parking access through the hedge. He stated that he would not be supportive if this application was for permanent approval, but he believed that giving a one-year temporary approval, would allow them to see what issues may arise.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions listed within the attached appendix.

(Note - the committee voted eight to two in favour of this application being temporarily approved.)

Item Four - DM/0617/21/FUL - 18 Lytham Drive, Waltham

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect an extension to the front to include first floor rooms in roof space, erect single storey store extension to side, convert existing roof space and installation dormer to side with various alterations. He added that amended plans had been submitted to remove the first floor side dormer bedroom window and insert a new first floor front window to dormer and revised light assessment details had been included. It was considered that the dormer has been designed in such a way to reduce impacts of overlooking by including an obscured glazed opening only that was adjacent to the neighbour's rear garden and following amendments, a secondary window which had been relocated to the front of the dormer facing into the applicant's own driveway and garden. This arrangement was considered to be acceptable in order to prevent overlooking in this instance. It was important to note that the dormer would be considered to be permitted development based on the cubic content of this. The extension to the front would be adjacent to the side wall of the neighbour's garage and side elevation of the dwelling. Whilst the extension would sit in close proximity, the distance from the sidewall would be 4.8 metres which hosted the window of concern for the neighbour.

Mr Limmer stated that following concerns raised by the neighbour, a light test had been conducted by the agent. This demonstrated that the light test was passed, and further assessment in this regard was not necessary. Thus, the impact in this regard would not be unduly adverse. In conclusion, it was considered that the proposed development would not unduly harm the appearance of the street scene, the wider character of the area or neighbours' residential amenities and was recommended for approval.

Mrs Johnson spoke as an objector to the application. She explained that she had lived at 19 Lytham Drive for over 7 years. She considered the proposal too big of a build and would not be in keeping with the rest of the properties close by. The outcome would be overbearing to them and there would be a loss of sun light, loss of amenity and privacy and a detrimental impact on their lives and wellbeing. The property was built in the 1970s and had interrupted light for several years. Right of light had to be

sympathetically considered. The extension would cover their window and give them a locked in feeling. The extension was 0.96 metre close to the boundary. The size and depth of the proposal would mean their property being overshadowed. The extension would be visually intrusive and adversely affect the appearance of the street scene. It would be the only dwelling to have a loft extension with a front facing window and a front extension. Lytham Drive did not have road access to anywhere. They were mostly ground floor bungalows with some exceptions. The ones that had dormers posed no threat to other properties and did not overlook other people's windows. Mrs Johnson explained that they were in their late 70s and this was supposed to be their forever home. She stated that photos provided by Mr Blair were properties far away and not within sight. She strongly disputed the report saying that it would not be overbearing and asked Members to take this on board and refuse the application.

Due to work commitments the applicant was unable to attend the meeting, therefore it was agreed for Democratic Services to read out a statement submitted by Mr David Blair.

Mr Blair noted the objections from neighbours but felt that some were extraneous and understandably biased in the objector's favour. He also considered that some of their claims were exaggerated with the omissions of relevant facts made to support their objections. He addressed only those objections which he believed to be relevant to planning permission. He did not offer his perspective regarding the many objections raised appertaining to right to light as he did not have the expertise to accurately and fully interpret the legislation, but he noted that the application had passed the relevant light test.

With regard to concerns about residential amenity, Mr Blair noted that they had tried to consider any possible impact of the extension on his neighbours and the local area, which he believed was reflected in the plans and which his architect has clearly stated in his design statement.

On the extension being overbearing, Mr Blair would perhaps concur if the front of the extension was proposed to be in line with the front of number 19, as were other adjacent bungalows in the area, but it was proposed to extend it forward by 3.20m which would be approximately 6.5m back from the front of number 19. Therefore, the proposed front extension would be less intrusive to neighbours than the impact that other adjacent bungalows had on each other in Lytham Drive, whose fronts were in line. Number 19 had a side entrance with an adjacent side window, both facing Mr Blair's property. In order to limit any possible impact on neighbours he had deliberately not applied for planning permission to extend the bungalow beyond the right edge of this side window. The front edge of the proposed extension would be approximately 1.2m back from the left edge of their side main entrance door.

Reference was made to the huge store / utility extension on the opposite side of the property to number 19. The plans clearly showed that this would only be a forward projection of the pre-existing attached side

garage, although it was no longer used for this purpose. It could already be clearly seen from the roadside as could other attached side garages in the area. There was no proposal to extend our property sideways. It would not bring it closer to No. 19 and would be no closer than the distance between other bungalows in the area. The closest part of number 19 to our property was their garage which was to the eastern side of their property. It was stated that the room affected by the proposed extension faced north and this information was used to highlight the limited light, both daylight and sunshine, that it received. This was inaccurate as the window actually faced east. The objection referred to a 2-storey extension to the front. This was both inaccurate and misleading. The proposed extension plans clearly showed that the building would continue to be a single storey bungalow with a loft conversion. The roof ridge would not be raised in height.

Reference was made to the impact of the proposed dormer on the neighbour's garden with overshadowing and diminished sunlight and daylight. It was stated that there was only a tunnel of light channelled into the garden, presumably from between the two properties. He found it difficult to understand why this should currently be the case as the gap between the properties was in a north easterly position.

The proposed dormer in relation to the garden at number 19 would also be in a north easterly position and would project 2.17m beyond the back of their garage and not beyond the 3m canopied area of their garden which abutted the boundary. As the gardens were southerly facing, any impact from the proposed dormer should be minimal. The most impact should continue to be from the existing building.

Whilst Mr Blair did not dispute that their neighbours felt that the proposed extension would adversely affect them, he respectfully suggested that when considering their statements around the huge detrimental impact on their lives and well-being, it was borne in mind that the room in question was the smallest room in their home.

With an extension of 3.20m, Mr Blair would still have a front garden greater in area than other gardens located around the roundabout and Lytham Drive, so remaining in keeping with others. The extension would be stepped in line with number 17 and 19 retaining continuity. The proposed extension did not affect the footprint of the bungalow appertaining to its width, with pathways to either side of the property. It would not, as stated, practically stretch from one boundary to the other. It would continue to be in keeping with other properties in the area with attached side garages. In fact, many other properties had extended sideways to their boundary.

Councillor Jackson spoke as the Ward Councillor for this application. He explained how he had called in the application with the view that the proposed application was overdevelopment of this site. The proposed dwelling would become very large and overbearing. He stated that you know it's bad when the Civic Society put in objection to residential

property. He was surprised by Officers recommendation for approval. He believed it was inappropriate for the area and he hoped the Committee would take into account the objections that had been put in front of Members.

Councillor Mumby spoke on behalf of Waltham Parish Council. She wanted to voice concerns that if approved the result property would be significantly larger than any other property on Lytham Drive. The proposed dormer covered the full height of the existing roof and its full length. She stated that the design statement for the different roof design was very misleading. The proposal was to be of a dominant style and she indicated that this may be why the Civic Society felt the need to comment on this application. All properties were plain brick with tiled roofs. All of a natural finish. There were no details in the application about landscaping and she wondered whether the extension to the front would affect off street parking, particularly as it was in a cul de sac location. There were a number of extensions and dormer bungalows in surrounding areas, but she reminded Members that each application should be accounted for on their own merits.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be refused, due to overdevelopment and over intensification of the site.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that he was familiar with the street. He explained that they were small bungalows close together. Introducing a large dormer would have a large impact on the street scene. He believed that if approved the extension, front and side, would have to have considerable conditions attached. He thought it was overdevelopment of the site and he seconded the proposal to be refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh was going to suggest a site visit, but he had been convinced by everyone who had spoken and knew that they knew the area well. He concurred with all that they were saying.

Councillor Hudson stated that at first glance he was happy with the front extension as they didn't think it would affect neighbouring properties, as well as being shown that light would still enter house. He also did not mind the rear extension. However, the dormer proposal was a different situation. He believed it was too much. He asked Officers whether the dormer bungalow could be done under permitted development rights.

Mr Limmer stated that as the dormer stands, it could not be implemented under permitted development rights as the window on the front was not being obscurely glazed and the dormer would also need to be 100mm off the eaves.

Councillor Parkinson explained that the presentation helped to get a better understanding of the proposal. He did not think the front extension would affect neighbouring properties that much. However, he believed all in all the proposal was very overbearing.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as the development would constitute an over development of the site to the detriment of the character of the street scene and adjacent residential amenity, contrary to Policy 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being refused.)

Item Five - DM/0503/21/FUL- Land Adjacent To 88 Seaford Road Cleethorpes

Ms Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought to erect a dormer bungalow and a detached single garage on land adjacent to 88 Seaford Road in Cleethorpes. Access would be from Seaford Road and include an off road driveway and turning area and new boundary treatments. However, Mr Limmer explained that the development failed to satisfy national planning policy in that the site was within an area of high flood risk and a small development of this nature, of only one dwelling, could be located within an area of lesser risk. There were no other overriding factors to set this sequential approach aside. The development was therefore unacceptable in principle and as a result would be contrary to the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) as well as the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

The applicant was unable to attend the meeting, therefore it was agreed for Democratic Services to read out a statement submitted by Mr Phil Bailey.

He stated that considerable effort had been made with the application to the satisfaction of the immediate neighbours at 71, 78 and 88 Seaford Road and 195 North Sea Lane, who all supported the revised proposal. The scheme would not only complement the existing street scene along Seaford Road but also tidy up the piece of waste land currently visible from Seaford Road, which currently was of no use and attracted litter and waste from some passers-by. There had been no objections whatsoever about the revised proposal either by members of the public or any of the council consultees. The only reason for recommending refusal appeared to be based on potential flood risk which, after consultation and the introduction of mitigating measures, the Environment Agency were happy with. In the unlikely event of a 1 in 200 breach of sea defences, the development would not have any increased detrimental effect on surrounding properties. Due to the mitigating factors incorporated within the design, the property would be sufficiently substantial to provide a safe and secure haven for its occupiers and not be subject to any major damage related to flooding.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that if they were to take officers recommendations it would mean that this plot would remain empty forever. He stated that the drainage officer had no objection, neither did the

environmental officer and all neighbouring properties supported the application. He did not want to see an unsightly gap. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hudson agreed with Councillor Mickleburgh. The plot looked like it needed building on. He stated that the site has had planning permission before. He seconded the proposal for the application to be approved.

Councillor Parkinson stated that the site had planning history. He hoped the proposal would include strong conditions to mitigate any flood issues that may present themselves. He explained that previously he did not support as it was for a pair of semi-detached houses, but now that it was for one detached dwelling, he was happy to support.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that it failed the sequential test, therefore, it was unacceptable for development; he was happy to stick with officer's recommendations.

Mr Dixon stated that for point of information an environmental officer would not raise objections when it came to failing a sequential test as it came under the remit for the local authority to raise.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the following conditions being adhered to:

- The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.
- The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:
Site Location Plan - RD4272-01-REV-0
Proposed Block Plan, Plans and Elevations - RD4272-04-REV-0
Proposed Garage and Boundary Treatments - RD4272-05-REV-0
- The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) reference RD4272 compiled by Ross Davy Associates and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:
Finished floor levels to be set no lower than 1.0m above the existing ground level;
Flood resilience and resistance measures to be incorporated into the proposed development as stated;
The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently remain in place.
- Development shall not begin until details showing the location, layout, design and method of construction of any new or altered vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring space, including any necessary piping or culverting of any ditch or watercourse, have

been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and before development begins the vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring space shall be constructed in accordance with those approved details and shall thereafter be so retained

- No works related to the development hereby approved shall begin until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP should include, but not be limited to the following:
 1. Contact details of the person with responsibility for the implementation of the CMP;
 2. The expected number, types and size of vehicles during the entire construction period;
 3. The proposed daily hours of operation during the construction period;
 4. Details of on-site parking provision for construction related vehicles;
 5. Details of on-site storage areas for materials, if required;
 6. Details of expected delivery schedules and how this will be managed to eliminate waiting on the public highway (i.e. call ahead or pre-booking scheduling system), if required; and
 7. Details of wheel washing facilities (locations, types etc.).
 8. Details of the control measures that will be employed to control the impact of noise, vibration and dust during the construction phase

Once approved, the CMP shall be adhered to at all times during construction.

- No demolition or construction work shall be carried out on or before 08:00 or after 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, before 08:00 or after 13:00 on Saturdays and at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- Before development commences, a scheme for surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation of the dwelling.
- The external materials shall be as specified within the Design and Access Statement (RD4272), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- If during redevelopment contamination not previously considered be identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with

the Local Planning Authority. Remediation shall be undertaken in accordance with the details approved.

(Note - the committee voted nine to one in favour of this application being approved).

Item Six - DM/0821/20/FUL - College House, 87 College Street, Cleethorpes

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought permission to change the use of 87 College Street from a former care home to a 15-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). Access would be via College Street with access to the rear garden by a side alleyway. No off-street parking was proposed on site. There were 8 bedrooms proposed on the ground floor with various facilities including communal living space, bathrooms and kitchens. At first floor there were 7 bedrooms with further communal facilities to accommodate these first floor occupants. This proposal was located within the development area of Cleethorpes and the principle of additional residential accommodation in this area was supported. Residential amenity concerns were noted but the details provided a layout which would meet the Housing Officers standards along with natural light to each habitable room and access to outdoor amenity areas. Similarly, whilst a more intensive form of development, it would not be dissimilar to the care home capacity when full and would not therefore appear out of keeping in terms of density. Finally, the site was located within a highly sustainable area reducing the reliance on motor vehicles. As such, subject to conditions, the application was recommended for approval.

Mr Hone spoke in objection to the application. He explained how the proposal had no design and access statement. It had nothing to do with disability usage and there were no police crime reports regarding amended applications. Fifteen people living in HMO compared to a care home was very different. He stated that residents of College Street were very concerned. He asked Members to consider objections received and refuse the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh thought this application was weird when he first read it. His attention was immediately drawn to anti-social behaviour concerns. He believed that if approved it would need to be well managed. He wondered who owned the property as it may mean that it had an absent landlord/agent.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he was struggling with this application. He wanted to work with planners as this would bring a redundant building back into use. Having fifteen people in a place this size, he could not see it being well behaved.

Councillor Silvester had concerns as he was familiar with another former care home being granted with the same type of permission. He was

worried this would go down the same road and who would manage and run the place. He moved for the application to be refused.

Councillor Beasant seconded the proposal to be refused. He had great concerns because if approved it would be the biggest HMO in the Borough. Fifteen people in a property of this size had a potential to create anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Hasthorpe had grave concerns on facilities and the number of kitchen and bathrooms available. He believed it would cause arguments and anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he had reservations as it was never easy to manage a HMO of this size.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as the development would constitute an unacceptable intensification of use at the site, due to the number of units proposed, which would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents by reason of noise, disturbance and potential for anti-social behaviour contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being refused.)

P.20 PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Resources under delegated powers during the period 2nd July 2021 to 1st August 2021.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.21 PLANNING APPEALS

At the time of the agenda being published and the meeting taking place there were no planning appeals awaiting decision nor any in progress.

P.22 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded for the following business on the grounds that its discussion was likely to disclose exempt information within paragraph 6 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

P.23 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The committee discussed issues relating to enforcement and raised a number of matters for further investigation.

RESOLVED – That the information be noted, and further investigations be carried out as requested.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 12.16 p.m.