

Supplementary Planning Agenda – 6th October 2021

Item 1 – Humberston Road – DM/0552/21/FUL

Amended plans and Arboricultural Scheme received on the September 24th to include landscaping within open space.

Approved Plans condition amended to the following:

Condition

The development is approved in accordance with the following plans:

Site Location Plan - HR/167/02

Proposed Site Plan - HR/167/06D

Proposed Site Layout South - HR/167/04C

Proposed Site Layout North - HR/167/03D

Proposed Site Sections - RD4709 - 02

Proposed Landscaping Plan - HR/167/10C

Proposed Materials - HR/167/07A

Proposed House Mix - HR/167/08A

Proposed SUDS Plan - HR/167/09B

Boundary Treatments - HR/167/11B

Boundary Treatments - HR/167/12B

Boundary Treatments - HR/167/03

Boundary Fence and Wall Detail - SD/16/006

Site Access Arrangement Plan - HRG-BWB-HML-XX-DR-TR-101 S2 P2

Highways Widths and Bin Collection Points - HR/167/13A

Proposed Plans and Elevations of Dwellings:

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Canterbury 1 - CCM/AS/18/101

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Canterbury 1 - MCA/AS/18/101

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Canterbury 2 - CCM/AS/19/102

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Canterbury 2 - MCA/AS/18/102

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Canterbury 2 Opp - MCA/OP/18/102

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Canterbury 2 Passage -
MCM/AS/12/102

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Canterbury 1 Opp - MC/OP/19/102

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Canterbury 1 Opp - MCA/OP/18/101

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Cleveland - MC/AS/19-102

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Malvern and Cleveland 1 Opp - MC/OP/19/101

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Canterbury 1 - CA/AS/18/101

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Canterbury 2 - CA/AS/18/102

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Chatsworth 3 - CH/AS/12/103

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Chatsworth 3 Opp - CH/OP/12/103

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Dutchess 2 Opp - DU/OP/19/102

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Dutchess 3 - DU/AS/18/103

Proposed Plans and Elevations - Dutchess 3 Opp - DU/OP/18/103
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Dutchess 6 - DU/AS/18/106
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Dutchess 6 Opp - DU/OP/19/106
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Ancholme 3 - AA/AS/19/103
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Buckingham 3 Opp - BU/OP/18/103
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Buckingham 6 - BU/AS/19/106
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Buckingham 6 Opp - BU/OP/18/106
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Haywood 2 - HY/AS/19/102
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Haywood 3 - HY/AS/19/103
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Kingston 1 - KI/AS/19/101
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Kingston 1 Opp - KI/OP/19/101
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Kingston 2 - KI/AS/18/102
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Kingston 2 Opp - KI/OP/18/102
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Kingston 3 - KI/AS/18/103
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Kingston 3 Opp - KI/OP/18/103
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Kingston 6 Opp - KI/OP/19/106
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Wordsworth 1 - W/AS/18/101
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Wordsworth 1 Opp - W/OP/18/101
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Wordsworth 2 - W/AS/18/102
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Wordsworth 2 Opp - W/OP/18/102
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Wordsworth 3 - W/AS/18/103
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Wordsworth 3 Opp - W/OP/19/103
Proposed Garage Plot 1 - GA/HR/P1
Proposed Garage Plot 6 - GA/HR/P6
Proposed Garage Plot 9 - GA/HR/P9
Proposed Garage Plot 10 and 23 - GA/HR/P10-23
Proposed Garage Plot 20 and 21 - GA/HR/P20-21
Proposed Garage Plot 22 - GA/HR/P22
Proposed Garage Plot 63 - GA/HR/P63
Proposed Garage Plot 104 and 105 - GA/HR/P104-5
Proposed Garage Plot 107 and 108 - GA/HR/P107-8
Proposed Garage Plot 110 - GA/HR/P110
Proposed Garage Plot 117 - GA/HR/P117
Proposed Garage Plot 122 - GA/HR/P122
Proposed Annexe Plot 5 - GA/HR/P5

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and to accord with policies 5, 13, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

Tree and Woodlands Officer further comments – I note that there are amendments to the Arboricultural planting scheme which are acceptable and address the points I have raised with that document. Regards to the plans I still do not see the

amendments I require. However, as per our phone conversation I would have no major objections to the details relating to planting distances between trees and distance from curb lines being conditioned under the stands landscaping condition if required.

Condition 12 (Landscaping) therefore amended to the following:

Condition

Prior to occupation of any dwelling, final details of the scheme of landscaping and tree planting, including all public open space areas, to follow the Landscaping Plan (drawing ref: HR/167/10 D) and Planting Plan Rev B (drawing ref: PP - 210430 Humberston Rd Grimsby) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the timings and phasing of the landscaping as it relates to each phase of the development, **details relating to planting distances between trees and distance from curb lines**, and details of trees and hedges to be retained and measures for their protection during the construction period. Hedgerows shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the details approved. All planting shall be implemented in accordance with the details and timings approved and shall be adequately maintained for 5 years, beginning with the date of completion of the planting of each phase and during that period all losses shall be replaced during the next planting season. All tree and hedge protection measures shall be implemented as approved during the construction period.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory appearance and setting for the development and continued maintenance of the approved landscaping in the interests of local amenity in accordance with policies 5 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

Crime Reduction Officer comments – There are quite a few recessed gates in the design which does create some opportunities to the side. The applicant would benefit from incorporating the SBD physical security that would achieve the SBD silver award.

It has been confirmed by the applicant and the Council's Highways Officer that the signalised pedestrian crossing on Humberston Road will be a Puffin crossing and not a Toucan crossing.

Section 3 – Page 16 – reference should be Puffin and not Toucan.

Recommended Condition No 4 (h) ...to read ...the proposed Puffin crossing ...

Comments attached from Grimsby, Cleethorpes and District Civic Society.

ITEM 4 – DM/0077/21/FUL – Land off Main Road, Barnoldby le Beck

Comments attached from 4 Beck Farm Mews.

Angela Tynan (Engie)

From: Alan Nicholson
Sent: 28 September 2021 11:10
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Cc: Sue Milsom; Executive Committee member
Subject: DM/0552/21/FUL

Good Morning,

The planning group of Grimsby, Cleethorpes & District Civic Society wish to make the following comments regarding the above planning application, DM/0552/21/FUL, Erection of 122 dwellings etc., on land off Humberston Road, Grimsby.

"We seek modification on the proposed number of properties, and development of land, as it would appear that they do not fit in with the existing housing stock and the established environment, or in any way reflect current need to counter the climate crisis.

We note the comments raised with this proposed development, and have our own concerns. The extra road traffic from numerous additional vehicles will result in further traffic problems on Humberston Road, and adversely impact on pedestrian and cyclists' safety. Also, the proposed increased complex road layout to counteract this - the proposed pedestrian crossing between Davenport Drive and Love Lane corner, road junction on to the development and the central refuge - will all create traffic build up and increased air pollution issues.

As regards drainage issues, our research finds that the dyke behind the hedge fronting Humberston Road is part of the flood relief for King George V Stadium, and is served by a drain that goes under Weelsby Road, Vaughan and Vivian Avenues, and empties into the dyke, ergo, the developer's need to provide swales. The idea of supplying water butts only, to collect rain water instead of "proper" drainage does not seem a feasible way of dispersing surface water, Water butts are only of use to avid gardeners who actually use them; full water butts still flood. We would argue therefore, that a sustainable drainage system, using a watercourse connected to a sewer, as outlined in the Anglia Water report, is the most effective proposition. We note a contradiction in the proposed planting of trees, and the creation of swales. A disadvantage of their use is that they limit opportunities to plant trees, and landscape areas. Also, in relation to the planting of trees, who would be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the new planting, local authority, developer or householder?

We are disappointed that there is no mention of renewable power sources for this development, such as solar panelling, heat pumps, electric vehicle charging, or indeed, the quality of insulation proposed, all of which should surely be seriously considered as essential for a planned development of quality for the 21st Century.

Furthermore, we believe that there are sufficient brownfield sites available for development, without destroying a reasonable site of naturalised landscape. Overall the Civic Society are concerned at the propensity to use greenfield sites to build regular properties on non-generous plots that offer limited flexibility in future use, i.e., size, multi-aged, and multi-generational families.

We therefore oppose the proposed development in its current form".

Alan Nicholson, Acting Chair of GC&DCS Planning Group

Chair, GC&DCS

DM/0077/21/FUL Land off Main Rd Barnoldby le Beck

I object to the retrospective planning of the removal of an extremely large amount of knotweed from a nearby development site which was then dumped at the end of our garden against the approved planning method of screening and removal (several knotweed reports including this one concluded that relocation was not a viable option). The notifiable waste has been moved off the development site against the approved planning as it was a cheaper way to get rid of it to prepare the site for saleable building plots rather than following the method set out in the planning (we were informed of this by workers on the site removing the knotweed). We were informed by the knotweed workers that they had never relocated such a large amount and had only relocated above ground to a depth of 15-25cm before, the height of this is over 1 metre over an extremely large area of which many trees have had to be felled to make room for it. The knotweed had spread and got to a much more serious situation from their initial report due to an un-effective and non-professional spraying treatment (not performed by a specialist company) and the knotweed workers told us the same would happen after this relocation if a professional treatment plan was not enforced. Spraying in the relocation area concerns us as it will be so close to our garden and that of others where our children play and also a water way. This brings me to the point of the plans submitted by Ross Davey which are wildly inaccurate and have been confirmed as such by a site visit by the case officer. As already noted the height of the dumped knotweed is way over a metre (also seen by the case officer) but is marked as only half a metre on these plans. The distance of the very right of the knotweed against the boundary of the site is marked as 24.5 metres when it is actually approximately 7 metres (again as seen by the case officer) - also importantly this boundary which it is wrongly marked as 24.5 metres from is a free flowing water way which is not even marked on the plans which should be an important point to note when considering if the area to relocate to is suitable when considering a treatment plan needed to control it going forward. The site location plan outlined in red is also wrong and seen as such by the case officer. My concerns also extend to the fact that the local environment department have said they have 'no comment' on this planning application - is this due to them seeing no water way on the submitted plans? - even so the national environment agency had concerns that a notifiable waste had been moved without permission and that the local environmental department should visit the site back in the summer last year but despite numerous telephone messages and emails sent by us no one has ever responded to us from the local council environmental department - something that we and the national agency find shocking and then to see them simply say 'no comment' just tops it off. The plans currently showing as I make this comment on the last day for comments to be submitted (21/2/21) are still those that are wrong so I don't see how any of the comment etc already made on the planning by such council departments can be taken into account when they are made on inaccurate information. To summarise it would be a travesty for planning to retrospectively approve an action which was made against previously approved planning as a way to cut costs for the developer. We are now faced with a huge amount of notifiable waste dumped in our village in an unauthorised and unsuitable area with many dog walkers and families walking and cyclists seen from our garden daily going through the area potentially spreading it all over the village. The knotweed company told me to get rid of the trainers I was wearing when I walked to the area as it can spread on your shoes. We initially made no comment on the planning of the plots as the development site is not near to our land and would not impact us but by taking this knotweed off the development site and dumping it at the end of our garden it has greatly effected us. The system should not be that people can go against approved planning and simply get retrospective planning for the aspects they didn't like as then what is the point in having a planning system to start with?

Kate Bradshaw

4 Beck Farm Mews