



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 29th September 2022

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10th August 2022 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Pettigrew (in the Chair)
Councillors Batson, Beasant, Croft, Dawkins, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Lindley,
Mickleburgh, Parkinson, Shutt (substitute for Goodwin).

Officers in attendance:

- Richard Limmer (Major Projects Planner)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Property Lawyer)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highways and Transport Planner)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)

Others in attendance:

There were 4 members of the public present and no members of the press.

P.19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence from this meeting were received from Councillor Goodwin.

P.20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received in respect of any item on the agenda for this meeting.

Councillor Mickleburgh raised concerns regarding the room that was being used to host Planning Committee. He suggested future Planning Committee meetings take place in the Crosland Suite.

Miss Pickerden informed Committee members that there were ongoing discussions taking place regarding moving Planning Committee meetings to the Crosland Suite.

Item 1 - DM/0484/22/FUL – 13 Cheesemans Lane, Waltham,

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought to erect a two storey side extension to include the installation of roof lights and associated internal and external alterations at an existing semi-detached dwelling. Mr Limmer stated that the development was acceptable in principle as the design of two storey extensions were not uncommon in residential developments. Mr Limmer said that the extension would be set back from the front and lower in height to appear secondary in appearance to the already existing dwelling. Mr Limmer stated that the application had been brought to committee due to objections raised by neighbours. Mr Limmer stated that the two storey extension would be 1.9 metres away from the boundary to the closest neighbour and that the boundary was established by hedging which would provide a degree of screening. Mr Limmer stated that the design had changed and that the original scheme had included a juliet balcony which resulted in several objections from neighbours due to concerns around overlooking and privacy. Mr Limmer confirmed to committee members that the balcony had been removed from the design. Mr Limmer stated that a window would be put in place of the previously proposed balcony. Mr Limmer informed committee members that some neighbours still had objections to the development, but he said that due to the distance of 29 metres, the development would have from properties to the rear, the level of separation was considered to be acceptable and would prevent issues of overlooking. Mr Limmer stated that the application was considered acceptable by the Drainage Team, Highways Team and that Waltham Parish Council supported the application. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with Policy 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (NELLP) 2013-2022 (adopted 2018) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he believed the application to be very straightforward and moved for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson commented that if lived next door to the property, he would most likely not like the application, however, he stated that he saw no planning grounds in which to reject the application.

The Chair stated that lots of work had been done by planning officers to reduce the impact on neighbours.

Councillor Croft stated that she saw no issues with the application. She said that she originally was concerned with the impact on privacy and overlooking. However, after seeing the photos, she was content with the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

(Note - the committee voted 10 for and 1 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 2 – DM/1169/21/FUL – 1 Main Road, Barnoldby Le Beck

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought to erect a detached dwelling with associated works to include access. Mr Limmer stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to an objection from Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council citing concerns with design, visibility and issues with the previous application. Mr Limmer explained that the proposed site was a vacant piece of land and was located within the development area of Barnoldby Le Beck. Mr Limmer stated that the development would not be seen as out of character as the Main Road already had a varied character. He stated that the development would include sufficient outside space. Mr Limmer informed committee members that while the highways team had determined that the development would not cause a significant impact on the wider highway network or cause a detrimental impact to highways safety, they had recommended conditions regarding visibility. Mr Limmer stated that the development was located in flood zone 1 and was at low risk of flooding. Mr Limmer explained that the design included openings, however, it had been determined that these openings would not negatively affect the privacy of neighbours or cause overlooking due to the degree of separation. Mr Limmer explained that the Environment Team had proposed a condition regarding the amount of hours construction work could be undertaken for due to the proximity of residential properties and the issues that could arise. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with Policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 42 of the NELLP 2013-2022 (Adopted 2018) and was therefore recommended for approval.

Mr Raithby spoke in support of the application. He stated that he had worked with planning officers to ensure the development fitted in with the street scene. He said that the materials had been specifically chosen with the street scene in mind. Mr Raithby stated that the development would be a family property and he commented that he had accepted all of the council's conditions. Mr Raithby informed committee members that he had worked with highways officers to ensure visibility requirements were met.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he accepted that there had been work undertaken with planning officers to achieve the best result. He commented that the development was not what he would normally envisage on the plot and queried whether the views of the parish council had changed from their viewpoint of the previous application.

Mr Limmer stated that Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council objected to the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the motion for the application to be approved. He stated that his only concern was the objection raised by the parish council about the previous application.

Councillor Lindley stated that he thought the design was in keeping with the design of the village. Councillor Lindley expressed concern that the full representations of the parish council and residents were not included in the agenda pack. He said that it was important for members to see all the information regarding each of the applications. Councillor Lindley stated that thought the application looked good, but that he wanted to see all the information included in the agenda pack.

Mr Dixon stated that the views of the parish council had not changed from the previous application. Mr Dixon commented that the decision to not include all representations within the agenda pack had been decided by a previous committee. Details of representations had been made available to committee members and were also available on the council's website.

Councillor Hudson stated that he was happy to approve the application. He commented that the reason the full representations were not included in the agenda pack was to reduce the size of printed agendas.

Councillor Shutt stated that he had an issue with the burning. He queried whether it could be agreed that burning would not occur.

Mr Limmer said that no burning of waste could be included in the condition.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he was happy with the application. Councillor Parkinson commented that he agreed with the concerns expressed by Councillor Lindley regarding representations not being included within the agenda pack.

Mr Thompson suggested to committee members that any issues regarding agenda papers be discussed later in the meeting. This was agreed by the committee.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

(Note - the committee voted 10 for and 1 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 3 - DM/0403/22/FUL – 41 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) following DM/0887/19/FUL to amend design of the dwelling. Mr Limmer explained to committee members that the development was acceptable in principle and that this had already been established when planning permission was originally granted under application DM/0887//19/FUL. Mr Limmer informed committee members that the new variation of development would have less of an impact on neighbours due to the development being of a lesser mass and scale and

the removal of the dormer windows from the design. Mr Limmer stated Humberston Village Council had maintained their objection to the application, citing concerns of impact on the character of the area and access provisions. Mr Limmer stated that the development would not harm the character of the area and that the design had changed to a more traditional design in keeping with the overall character of the area. Mr Limmer explained that the drainage team had asked for conditions to be included should the application be approved. Mr Limmer informed committee members that the access track would be widened and improved as part of the development to allow for vehicles to pass each other safely. He stated that there was a pinch point where the access track currently narrowed to 2.5m, and that would be widened to 2.9m. Mr Limmer stated that the fire brigade had not raised any objections relating to the pinch point but that a fire suppression system would be installed within the property through a condition being imposed. Mr Limmer stated that the highways team had determined that the proposed development would not cause an undue risk to highway safety. Mr Limmer stated that subject to safeguarding conditions, the application was in accordance with Policies 5, 22, and 33 of the NELLP (Adopted 2018) and was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Hudson stated that he was happy to move for approval of the application.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he found the new design to be less extensive and less objectionable to neighbours. He said that there was no reason to disapprove of the application as it had previously been voted for.

Councillor Parkinson queried whether back land development would be a reason to object to the application.

Mr Limmer stated that the application was to vary the house type and that the principle of development had been established through the original permission.

Councillor Lindley stated that he was happy to approve the application. He commented that for personal reasons, he was not a fan of the development but saw no planning reasons to object.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

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

Item 4 - DM/0553/22/FUL – Land To The Rear Of 309 Louth Road, Grimsby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought to demolish the garage at 309 Louth Road, erect 2 detached bungalows with garages, erect a detached garage for 309 Louth Road, erect fencing and various associated works. Mr Limmer explained that the site was located outside of the development boundary for Grimsby and that the site was located on open countryside land. Mr Limmer said that Policy 5 did not allow for development on open countryside land, however, he said that committee members must take into consideration the Council's 5-year housing plan and the need for sustainable development. Mr Limmer informed committee members that the development would be located on a sustainable site with close access to shops, services, and schools. He said that the site was also located within flood zone one meaning there was low risk of flooding occurring. Mr Limmer stated that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties as there was to be a substantial distance between them and the proposed bungalows. Mr Limmer stated that there had been no objections raised by neighbours regarding the application. Mr Limmer explained that the proposed development would not create a significant detrimental impact to the character of the area as while there would be an unusual step out from the rear building line of Louth Road, there would also be a strong boundary to the south in the form of a hedge which would screen most of the proposed dwellings. Mr Limmer stated that the access road would be improved to ensure that there would not be a detrimental impact on highway safety. Mr Limmer explained that the improvements would be enforced through conditions. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with the core principles of the NPPF and Policies 5, 22 and 33 of the NELLP, and was therefore recommended for approval.

Mr Snowden spoke in support of the application. Mr Snowden informed committee members that the site was already for residential use and that they would not be changing the use of the site. Mr Snowden said that the application was supported by highways and drainage officers, as well as the parish council. Mr Snowden stated that the application would support housing objectives in North East Lincolnshire.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he believed there was no grounds to object. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe agreed with Councillor Mickleburgh and seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that the development was in his ward. He said that he thought the design was good but was concerned about the access onto Louth Road. He stated that he was happy to support the application, but that widening access was important.

Councillor Hudson stated that he liked the hawthorne hedge that would screen the bungalows. He said that he was happy it would be bungalows being built rather than houses as houses would stand out. He said he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Batson stated that he would support the application. He queried whether residents would know where the cycling path started and where it ended.

Ms Hattle said that the cycle lane position would not be changing and that the proposed amends to the access would improve visibility.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

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

P.22 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 1st – 27th July 2022.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.23 PLANNING APPEALS

The committee received a report from the Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Resources regarding outstanding planning appeals

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.24 URGENT BUSINESS - REPRESENTATIONS

The committee discussed the circulation of the full representations for each planning application as part of the agenda.

Councillor Lindley reiterated that he thought that the agenda should contain all representations received for each application. Councillor Lindley further stated that he found it difficult to find the representations on the website. Miss Pickerden informed committee members that the full representations were sent to members via email and that a paper copy could be provided if requested. Councillor Parkinson stated that he would like the representations to be included within the agenda alongside the corresponding application. Councillor Beasant stated that he was happy to continue to receive his agenda and the representations via email. Miss Pickerden reiterated to members that they could request a paper copy of the representations prior to the meeting. Councillor Mickleburgh requested that a paper copy of the representations be available at Grimsby Town Hall so the public could access them.

RESOLVED -

1. That an email be sent to all committee members outlining where they can find the representations for each application.
2. That discussions be held with relevant staff at Grimsby Town Hall regarding the display of representations for access by the public.

P.25 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.26 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The committee considered any requests from any member of the committee to discuss any enforcement issues.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 11.10 a.m.