



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 27th July 2023

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1st March 2023 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Pettigrew (in the Chair)

Councillors Batson, Beasant, Croft, Dawkins, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Lindley, Mickleburgh, Parkinson and Patrick (substitute for Goodwin).

Officers in attendance:

- Emily Davidson (Town Planner)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Richard Limmer (Senior Town Planner)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Property Lawyer)
- Vicky Thompson (Environmental Protection Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Harness (Humberston and New Waltham Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Silvester (Park Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Westcott (Park Ward Councillor)

There were 33 members of the public present and one member of the press.

P.71 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.72 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hudson declared a non-registrable interest in item 7 of P.73 DM/1032/22/FUL as he knew the applicant and the objector.

Councillor Pettigrew declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 11 of P.73 DM/1066/22/FUL as he had previously had business dealings with the applicant.

Councillor Pettigrew declared an other registrable interest in item 15 of P.73 DM/0679/22/FUL as he is a Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Councillor.

Councillor Hudson declared a non-registrable interest in item 15 of P.73 DM/0679/22/FUL as he knew the applicant.

Councillor Hasthorpe declared a non-registrable interest in item 16 of P.73 DM/0662/22/FUL as he knew the applicant.

P. 73

DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Item 1 - DM/0527/22/FUL – Thorpe Park Holiday Camp, Anthony's Bank, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought retrospective redevelopment of an outdoor activities area with associated landscaping, drainage, and underground infrastructure. Mr Dixon said that some of the works had been granted previous planning permission under DM/1037/21/FUL but had not been installed as approved under that permission and that that was the reason the retrospective application had been submitted. Mr Dixon stated that the stage was the main issue and that lots of representations had been received including an objection from Humberston Village Council. He said that the main issue had been noise and that this was reflected in the representations. Mr Dixon said that the site's use was well established. Mr Dixon stated that the development was acceptable in principle as it served to enhance the visitor economy for Cleethorpes. He explained that there had been some objections raised regarding the impact to the character of the area. Mr Dixon said that the character of the area would not be impacted negatively by the development as the works that had been asked for were in line with the current character of the site and he said that the proposed site and the Humberston Fitties were located in an allocated resort area where there is an expectation of activities in the surrounding area associated with holiday uses. Mr Dixon stated that there had been concerns raised in the representations regarding the impact on conservation and that the application would not be in line with Article 4 which protected the Humberston Fitties as a conversation area. Mr Dixon explained that the proposed site was not covered by Article 4 and was therefore not subject to the conditions. Mr Dixon stated that the heritage officer had not raised concerns regarding the development. Mr Dixon said that a noise report had been submitted and had been deemed acceptable by the environmental protection officer. He said that the environmental protection officer had determined that there would not be an undue impact on the neighbouring properties but had recommended conditions. Mr Dixon stated that the ecology officer had not raised any concerns about the development and had determined that there would not be no undue impact on the Humber

Estuary SPA based on the information outlined in the noise report. He stated that Natural England had also not raised any objections to the development. Mr Dixon said that the development was acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring properties due to the distance between the site and the Humberston Fitties as well as the screening that existed. Mr Dixon said that there had been a landscaping condition included in the plans. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 34, 39 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Peet spoke in objection to the application. He said that the changes that had been made since the previous application were significant. He asked that the committee reject the application and that the applicant submit a new application which reflected the environment. Mr Peet stated that he did not object to Thorpe Park but did object to the idea of them being able to control the noise. He commented that the noise had ruined his year. Mr Peet said that the cumulative impact of the noise and lack of noise cancelling measures was a continued failure of Thorpe Park's ability to meet the planning conditions. Mr Peet said that he had raised his concerns with a councillor about the applicant allowing construction work to take place during the early hours of the morning, he said that this was a breach. Mr Peet stated that the councillor was told by the applicant that this was not true, but he said that this morning he had awoken to the noise of construction work. Mr Peet commented that the applicant had lied to officers. He explained that intervention from officers had begun only due to neighbours complaining to officers about the noise. Mr Peet stated that there had been 16 breaches of planning and licensing conditions, but that the applicant had been allowed to continue. He said that there had been no planning enforcement, no fines issued and he commented that it could be viewed that the Council had shown favour to the applicant. Mr Peet said that the design that the applicant had put forward would not help with the issue of noise and that more people would result in more crowd noise. Mr Peet stated that the applicant had acted with a complete disregard to neighbours and had not complied with the planning conditions. Mr Peet asked committee members to refuse the application.

Mr Smith spoke as the agent for the application. He said that committee members would be aware that previous planning permission had been approved for the site but that the new application they were considering was similar. He explained that during the construction phase, changes were put forward to make the development better. Mr Smith said that the changes would provide an improved experience for guests. He said that he was aware of the objections regarding noise but said that as soon as noise complaints were received, a revised plan was put forward as well as a robust complaints system. Mr Smith said that there was a noise impact assessment in place. He stated that there had been no statutory objections against the application. Mr Smith said that he hoped committee members would approve the application.

Councillor Harness spoke as Ward Councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He said that the Humberston Fitties and Thorpe Park had existed together in harmony for many years. He stated that residents wanted to be able to enjoy peace but that last year, that peace was stopped due to the noise. Councillor Harness said that he had received complaints from residents and some residents had been in tears. He stated that the outdoor stage that had been constructed had planning permission but had not been built as planned. He said that if the application was to be approved then the stage would stay in that place. Councillor Harness stated that he had respect for the planning committee and did not want to tell the committee how to vote, but he asked that committee members make sure they have been assured that the noise from Thorpe Park would not affect the Fitties or Humberston as a whole.

Councillor Dawkins said that he had visited the site when the issues first occurred and had also recently been to Thorpe Park. He said that the application had been brought before the committee as the applicant had not built the stage in the agreed place. Councillor Dawkins said that the sound coming from the stage towards the Humberston Fitties would always be a problem. He stated that he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was not from Humberston and that he lived in Grimsby and commented that he had not visited the site that much. He said that when he first looked at the plans, he thought they looked good but after listening to the concerns of residents regarding the noise he had concerns. Councillor Mickleburgh said that the stage had not been put in the place that had been originally planned. He said that unless a site visit took place when an event was on, it was difficult to know how loud the noise was. Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he could not support the application, particularly with the stage in the wrong place.

Councillor Lindley said that he supported the diversity of Cleethorpes as a councillor. He said it was important to have something in Cleethorpes for everyone. Councillor Lindley stated that before the stage had been put up, the Fitties was a relatively quiet area. He commented that it was important to get the right balance and that it had been right previously but that this had now been disturbed. Councillor Lindley said that he wanted people to come to Cleethorpes but that this would put people off. He said he would not be supporting the application. Councillor Lindley stated that the application did nothing to boost the image of Cleethorpes and said that it would take away freedom of choice in the respect of what type of environment you want to stay in. Councillor Lindley said that it was important to maintain diversity in Cleethorpes.

Councillor Hudson said that he understood the desire of the applicant to increase visitors but that a previous scheme had already been approved and they had ignored that. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Patrick said that he thought that the location of either the North Promenade or Central Promenade would be more suitable. He said he didn't think the plans fitted in with the Humberston Fitties. Councillor Patrick said that he was strongly minded to oppose the application as it deviated massively from the area. He commented that the application could lead to a domino effect and could change that area of Humberston. Councillor Patrick said that he preferred applicants to be upfront and commented that he did not like retrospective applications. Councillor Patrick said that the objector was clearly not against development but that it needed to be the right one. He said that the applicant needed to consult with residents and assess the application again.

Ms Thompson said that she had become involved over the Summer regarding the stage and the noise impact. She said that the stage had not been placed where it should have been. She said that a noise limiter was agreed and that she had worked with the operator who had completed a noise impact assessment. Ms Thompson stated that the noise limiter would be set at a level, and it would not be able to be changed.

Councillor Parkinson queried whether if the noise was determined to be at a higher level than what was appropriate, would officers then cut off the noise.

Ms Thompson said that officers wouldn't cut the noise off. She reiterated that the noise limiter would be set at a specific level, and that this cannot be changed by the operator.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he thought the application read as a big company running roughshod over local people. He stated that councillors are elected to represent residents. He commented that members should refuse the application and support residents.

Councillor Lindley said that he agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe. He said that music would only be one source of the noise and that crowd noise was also relevant. He seconded the motion to refuse the application.

Councillor Batson said that he agreed with what other members had said.

Mr Dixon sought clarification on the reasons for refusal.

Councillor Hudson said that the detriment to neighbours was his main concern. He commented that had the applicant built in the agreed place, we might not be here today.

Councillor Patrick sought clarification on whether noise was a planning issue or an environment issue. He also queried whether the fact that the application was retrospective was a valid planning reason to refuse an application.

Mr Dixon stated that noise was a planning issue. He stated that an application cannot be refused on the grounds that it's just a retrospective application but planning concerns need to be articulated.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Item 2 – DM/0778/22/FUL - Plot 80, Humberston Fitties, Humberston

Mr Dixon provided the committee with additional papers regarding the application. He recommended that the committee deferred the application.

The Chair proposed that the application be deferred.

Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the motion of deferring the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred.

(Note – the committee voted 9 for and 2 against for the application to be deferred.)

Item 3 - DM/1036/22/FULA - 143 Mill Road, Cleethorpes.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect a new timber fence (2.2m high) and the demolition of a small section of dwarf wall. He said that there had been an amendment to the plans to remove the anti-climb spikes. Mr Dixon said that there had been lots of representations made by neighbours citing concern of an impact on the character of the area. Mr Dixon said that the proposed site was within the development boundary and was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon explained that the fence would be positioned in the rear garden. He said that a section of the dwarf wall would be demolished to allow for the new fencing. Mr Dixon stated that it was not considered that the fencing would be unduly harmful due to the height, design and position. Mr Dixon said that some negotiations had taken place with the applicant regarding the original design including the removal of anti-climb spikes from the plans. Mr Dixon said that the neighbour had raised concern over the raising of the ground levels, but he informed committee members that a condition was included in the plans which did not allow for them to be raised. Mr Dixon said that there had been concerns raised over the maintenance of the fencing. He explained that the fencing had been designed to allow for the panels to be removed for any maintenance work to be undertaken. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Till spoke in objection to the application. She said that she and her husband had purchased her property a while ago and that they had bought it as it was unique. Ms Till referred committee members to a photo she had provided showing what her view used to be like. Ms Till said that her neighbour had decided to remove the trees and that had taken away the conservation. She commented that it had taken away the birds and the squirrels. Ms Till stated that she understood that her neighbour wanted fencing but that they did used to have natural screening. Ms Till said that she objected to the fencing as she was unsure how the wall would be maintained. She explained that the wall needed repairing as it was damaged. Ms Till said that one whole section of the wall had been recommended to be rebuilt by the agent. She commented that she was concerned that her neighbour was building the ground up in order to make the wall higher. She said that with the ground now built up, the hedgehog holes had been filled and the hedgehogs could not get through. Ms Till said she was pleased that the anti-climb spikes had been removed from the plans as the area was a conservation area. Ms Till said that whilst she was pleased the plans had been amended regarding the anti-climb spikes, she still had concerns regarding them being put in at a later date.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He referred committee members to the photos that had been shown by officers and stated that the soil that was in the photos had been removed from the trench but would be put back. Mr Deakins denied that the applicant was wanting to raise the ground levels. He stated that the removal of the tree had not damaged the wall. He said that there had been a dispute with the neighbour about the wall but commented that his client would like a privacy screen. Mr Deakins said that typically in this scenario he would recommend making the wall slightly higher but as it was an old wall and due to neighbours disagreeing, he had recommended erecting a fence. Mr Deakins stated that the fence would not look out of place.

Councillor Hudson said that it was a shame that the neighbours had fallen out and that whilst he had sympathy for Ms Till, the trees were not hers. He said that fences like the one being proposed were common. Councillor Hudson moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it might have been a good idea to have asked for other trees to be put in place originally following removal. He said that he was pleased to see the anti-climb spikes being removed from the plans. Councillor Mickleburgh commented that in future, tree removal needed to be considered more. He seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson queried whether it was possible to have hedgehog holes put in.

Mr Dixon stated that officers could suggest that to the applicant.

Councillor Hudson said that he would propose an amendment to approve the application with the hedgehog holes being maintained.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lindley stated that there was nothing out of the ordinary within the application. He said he was not sure that an eight-inch gap would be big enough for the maintenance of the wall but that was not enough of a reason to refuse the application. Councillor Lindley said that he would be supporting the application but did sympathise with the neighbour.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 4 – DM/0682/22/FUL - 1b Weelsby Road, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought a retrospective change of use of an orangery to a childminding business. Mr Dixon stated it was not unusual for a residential property to also be used as a nursery, but he said the impact of the change of use must be assessed. Mr Dixon said that there were a total of six children that attended the nursery and three members of staff including the applicant. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had a licence for up to nine children to attend the nursery. Mr Dixon said that the highways officer had objected to the application citing the main concern of parents dropping off and collecting their children from the site. He said that the highways officer was concerned about this as there was no turning facility on the site and cars would be unable to access the property to drop off or collect their children, meaning they would have to use the main road or nearby streets, and this could not be mitigated by a condition. Mr Dixon explained that the highways officer had also said that the site was located near a main road and a busy junction. Mr Dixon stated that there had been an objection received from a neighbour citing concern regarding noise. He said that the environmental protection officer had assessed the application and had determined that provided that the number of children and hours of use was subject to conditions, then the application would not cause an undue impact on neighbours regarding noise. Mr Dixon stated that the application was not in accordance with policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Ms Flores spoke as the applicant. She said that she had moved back into the area after living in London. She said that whilst she was based in London, she had managed a nursery that was rated outstanding. Ms Flores stated that for the last four years, she had worked hard to create a business and had opened a nursery. She stated that she had obtained an Ofsted certificate a few years ago. Ms Flores explained that she had built her business up slowly and carefully and had adhered to all local council rules. She said that she had been informed numerous times that she did not require planning permission. Ms Flores stated that she had used her inheritance money to fund her business. Ms Flores explained that the children that attended her nursery were dropped off mainly by walking and didn't typically arrive in a vehicle. She said that only a couple of the parents

used a vehicle as means to drop their children off. She said that she had informed the parents to park on Welholme Avenue. Ms Flores said that ever since she had moved into the house, her drive had not been used and was also not used by the Ofsted inspector who was inspecting the nursery. Ms Flores said that she was expecting a good rating following the visit from the Ofsted Inspector. She commented that the day after the inspection, she was told that her application for planning permission had been denied.

Councillor Silvester spoke as Ward Councillor for the Park Ward. He queried the photo that had been displayed by officers and said that the photo did not represent a true reflection of the outside of Ms Flores property as there was no cycle lane outside. Councillor Silvester stated that Ms Flores had contacted Park Ward Councillors as she was unaware that she required planning permission. He said that that requirement had only recently been introduced. Councillor Silvester stated that Ms Flores business had been successfully operating for several years. He said that Ms Flores had not been informed of her right to appeal the officer's decision. Councillor Silvester explained that he had visited the nursery along with Councillor Westcott and said that they had both been impressed by the facilities the nursery had to offer. He commented that the property had been renovated to make the area welcoming for children and parents. Councillor Silvester said that during the visit, there were no vehicles there. He stated that there had been no issue with parking or traffic flow in the two years the nursery had been operating. Councillor Silvester said that he understood the concerns raised by the Highways Officer regarding emergency vehicles but said that the applicant did not own a vehicle and the parents didn't use the drive at the property. Councillor Silvester informed committee members that there had been a refuse vehicle outside of Ms Flores property that morning and that it hadn't affected traffic flow. Councillor Silvester said that it was vital to support and make sure children had the best start. He stated that there was no evidence to the claims that had been made by officers. Councillor Silvester informed committee members that Ms Flores would be happy to display a no parking sign. He asked committee members to overturn the recommendation of refusal.

Councillor Croft said that she passed the property every day and had never seen a car parked in the driveway. She said she was unsure what the issue was with the nursery. Councillor Croft said she noted that a noise concern had been raised but commented that St Martins Preparatory School was also close by which had more children attending. She moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that he thought it was a fantastic development and said that he would be happy for his children to attend the nursery. He said that the road was a main road but was wide and had yellow lines. Councillor Dawkins seconded the motion to approve the application and stated that the applicant should be commended for opening the nursery.

Ms Hattle informed committee members that there was a cycle lane outside of the property.

Councillor Lindley said there was no doubt of the value that the nursery provided to the community. He said that the issue of highways was the problem. He stated that there were two lanes of traffic and that it was an

already busy area. Councillor Lindley stated that the cycle lane was not an issue. He said that it was a dilemma as to whether the committee decided to trust the parents of the children regarding parking. He said that he was unsure and would listen to the debate but was leaning toward approval.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was not in a dilemma. He said that did not want to see someone lose their business. He commented that sometimes highways can be a red herring. Councillor Mickleburgh stated that the committee sometimes consider large developments that at times had no comments in regards to highways. He said that the applicant was reasonable and would speak to anyone who did park irresponsibly. He said that he thought it was a shame that the application had been refused in the first place as it would have caused the applicant a lot of uncertainty.

Councillor Beasant said he thought it was a fantastic nursery and was happy for it to go ahead.

Councillor Hudson said that there hadn't been a problem in two years. He said that he was sure that the applicant would speak to the parents if there were issues in relation to parking. Councillor Hudson commented that there were only six children at the nursery, and he doesn't see how that would cause a noise issue. He commented that you could have six children in a house anyway and that was not considered a noise issue. He said he was happy to support the application.

Mr Dixon outlined the conditions that could be included within the application if the committee was minded to approve. He said that this would include measures such as a formal review after 12–18-month period, and the nursery having a welcome pack which would include information about parking. He said that the committee could also add a condition outlining that no more than six children could attend the nursery and could also condition the hours of use.

Councillor Croft said that she was happy with that.

Councillor Dawkins stated that he did not want to see any restrictions added to the application. He said that the applicant had been successful for two years and he would not be happy with the conditions mentioned. Councillor Dawkins stated that the applicant had a licence to have nine children attend the nursery and said that he didn't think the committee should overrule that.

Councillor Lindley said that he was now assured and said he agreed with Councillor Hudson. He stated that the applicant had proven that she can run the nursery safely. Councillor Lindley said that he agreed with Councillor Dawkins regarding conditions. He said he would be supporting approval without conditions.

Councillor Hudson said that he would be happy to have a condition added regarding the number of children that could use the nursery as well as the hours of use but said that he would not be happy with a condition regarding a review.

Councillor Hasthorpe said he did not understand the need for a limit on the number of children that could attend the nursery. He said he was happy with the original application.

Councillor Patrick said that he would be happy for a condition to be added requiring that a review took place.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he had no issues with the application. He said he would only support a condition being added regarding hours of use.

Councillor Parkinson said that he would support a condition about hours and a condition about a maximum of nine children being able to attend the nursery.

The Chair said that he thought conditions should be added to the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he was concerned about the gates, and the possibility of children running out. He said he was quite happy with the hours of use.

Councillor Croft said that she would be happy with a condition regarding hours but did not want to add any other conditions. However, she said that her proposal that she had put forward was to approve the application without conditions.

The committee took a vote on the proposal of approving the application without conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

(Note - the committee voted 7 for and 4 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 5 - DM/0034/22/OUT - Land Rear of 30 Humberston Avenue, Humberston.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it was an outline application for the erection of 5 detached dwellings with the means of access to be considered. Mr Limmer stated that the application had been brought before committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Limmer explained that planning permission had been granted for the site previously. He said that the site was grassland but was located within the development boundary. Mr Limmer said that development was not prohibited on greenfield sites and that the site was in a sustainable location. Mr Limmer stated that the application would accord with policies 2 and 3 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan as the application would contribute to the area's housing needs and the range and quality of the dwellings, as well as being close to services. Mr Limmer said that the application was therefore acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer said that there had been four objections to the application. He said that those concerns would be considered during the reserved matters phase should the application be approved. He stated that consideration should be given to the access road

at this stage and said that concerns had been raised by neighbours regarding construction management. Mr Limmer stated that the highways officer had raised no objections to the principle of the development. He said that the highways officer had recommended a condition be added to be able to manage construction traffic. Mr Limmer said that the development would be close to two existing large scale residential developments and said that the impact the development would have on the wider character of the area would be minimal. He explained that the public would only see the access road and not the dwellings due to screening. Mr Limmer said that considerations such as the impact on trees would be considered at the reserved matters stage. Mr Limmer stated that the ecology officer had accepted the ecology report that had been submitted and was happy with the methods of mitigation. Mr Limmer stated that the site was not within a flood risk area. He explained that the drainage officer had requested a drainage plan and that a condition had been added to facilitate this. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 2, 3, 5, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Patrick said he thought it was an infill of an area and commented that he had no concerns about the application. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hudson seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said he thought that there was no reason to object to the application.

Councillor Dawkins queried whether two vehicles would be able to pass on the access road.

Councillor Lindley said he thought the access road seemed fairly adequate for two vehicles to be able to pass. He said he was happy to support the application.

Ms Hattle said that the access road was five metres wide at the front.

Councillor Dawkins queried whether there would be conditions added regarding time limits.

Mr Limmer said that there was a condition included which was standard regarding time limits.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.
(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved.)

Item 6 – DM/0591/22/FUL - 124 Humberston Avenue, Humberston.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought the demolition of an existing bungalow, detached garage and outbuilding and the erection of a new detached house, detached garage and detached garage/office/garden store. Mr Limmer stated that the site was located within the development boundary for Humberston, and he explained that policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan did not preclude replacing dwellings, garages or outbuildings. He said development of this kind was common in the Humberston area and that the development was acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer stated that Humberston Village Council had objected to the development due to concerns over the impact the development would have on the neighbouring properties amenities. He said that the proposed dwelling was of a larger scale than the current dwelling but that there was an acceptable separation between the dwelling and the neighbouring properties. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed dwelling would have windows at the front and at the rear facing the garden. He said that this was typical in a semi-rural setting and would not create an undue impact to the neighbouring properties. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed balcony at the rear elevation had been reduced and centralised with screens to reduce any overlooking. Mr Limmer stated that there had been a reduction in height and length to the proposed garage to reduce impacts on neighbours. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed garage and outbuilding would be visible to neighbours but would not impact upon their amenities. Mr Limmer said that the proposed dwelling would be brought in line with the neighbour's properties, which would reinforce the building line. He said that the design of the dwelling was in keeping with other more recently built dwellings and would not negatively affect the character of Humberston Avenue. Mr Limmer stated that garages and outbuildings were not uncommon in Humberston Avenue and explained that they would not be fully visible from the street. Mr Limmer stated that there had been no objections raised from the highways officer, tree officer or drainage officer. Mr Limmer said that there had been some concerns raised about the use of the proposed garage and outbuilding. He explained to committee members that a condition could be added to enforce that they could not be used as a business site. Mr Limmer stated that an additional condition had been added to the application about retaining the hedge, particularly on the eastern boundary of the site. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Scofin spoke as the applicant. He said that the proposal included the demolition of the bungalow which would be replaced with a detached house, garage and outbuilding. He said that the scheme was presented to members following alterations to plans after discussions with planning officers. Mr Scofin stated that the garage and outbuilding had been changed in size and height to an agreed amount. Mr Scofin explained that there had been concerns raised regarding the use of the

garage and it being used a business venture, he denied this was the case and said he was willing to agree to a planning condition to alleviate the concern. Mr Scofin stated that the new detached house would be in line with the building line unlike the existing bungalow. He said that the detached house would be a family home and that the character of the area would be maintained.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he could not see any reason to object to the application. He said he noted that some of the objectors outlined in the papers seem to live quite far away from the property. He proposed that the application to be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that he had concerns regarding the garage as he did not want to see it being used as a flat, however, he said the applicant had addressed those concerns and he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Patrick said that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he thought it was a very pleasing development. He said he did initially have concerns regarding the outbuilding being two storeys in height and the potential of a change of use but was happy to support the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 7 - DM/1032/22/FUL - 3 The Laurels, Church Lane, Humberston.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect a single storey side extension with roof lights and associated internal and external alterations. Mr Limmer stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to an objection from the Humberston Village Council. Mr Limmer said that the site was located within the development boundary of Humberston and was acceptable in principle. He said that the design of the extension was in keeping with the host property and that the materials that would be used would be the same. Mr Limmer said that several neighbours had written in support of the application. He said that an objection had been received from the developer of the land adjacent citing concerns over dominance. Mr Limmer explained that an application was pending regarding that land. He explained that the application for the extension was assessed based on the current situation but the potential future impact had also been taken into account. Mr Limmer said that the developer of the land adjacent had also raised concerns regarding building on the boundary.

He explained to committee members that the plans submitted with the application showed the extension within the boundary of the applicant's property and therefore was not an issue. Mr Limmer stated that there had not been any objections from the highways officer, drainage officer or heritage officer. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was happy to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Beasant and Councillor Mickleburgh left the meeting at this point.

Item 8 - DM/1037/22/FUL - Land off South Sea Lane, Humberston.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect a detached chalet dormer bungalow with car port, to include landscaping, parking and associated works. Mr Limmer stated that the site was located outside of the development boundary and was considered to be open countryside based on policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. Mr Limmer said that the site would have to be considered to be in a sustainable location to justify development as well as satisfy other requirements. Mr Limmer said that the proposed site would only be considered to be located in a marginally sustainable area due to poor pedestrian links to local services. He said that the application would provide an additional dwelling adding to the housing stock but that one dwelling was considered a small benefit that the application would provide. Mr Limmer said that the small benefit of an extra dwelling would not outweigh the detrimental impact of expanding development into the open countryside. Mr Limmer said that the Highways Officer had not objected to the application. He said that the Heritage Officer had objected citing concern that the development would negatively impact the views to and from the centre of Humberston. Mr Limmer stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 3, 5, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the development reflected the existing barns, and the barn conversion was the application legacy to the area but that they now want to move to a modest cottage. Mr Nelson informed committee members that two new

builds located close by had recently been given planning permission. Mr Nelson said that whilst the heritage officer had objected, he thought that material weight should be given to the positive comments received by neighbours and the fact that no other statutory officers had raised concerns. Mr Nelson said that there would not be a detriment to heritage assets. He explained that the proposal was for a single dwelling and said that the local plan showed development can be built on site which is close to heritage assets. Mr Nelson said that the scheme utilised the improved access to the barns and said that he thought the design would be an enhancement to the area. Mr Nelson stated that highways officers had no raised concerns about the development.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement provided by Councillor Shreeve and Councillor Harness.

The statement read that the proposed bungalow was part of a small site on South Sea Lane which had already been considerably developed using existing farm building in part. The statement read that the proposed bungalow was in keeping with the existing development and represented a small and final addition. The statement read that the comments made by the Heritage Officer were out of proportion and that the committee consider the application favourably.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he thought it might be a step too far into the open countryside. He said he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Lindley said that he thought it was the right structure. He stated that he agreed with the ward councillors regarding the comments provided by the heritage officer. Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said he was in two minds regarding the application and agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe. He commented that he was finding it difficult to accept the application.

Councillor Batson said he did not see any problem with the application. He said he would be supporting approval.

Councillor Hudson said he did agree with Councillor Hasthorpe at first but said that he didn't think the building looked big. He said it was a small size development and that he was leaning towards approval.

Councillor Patrick said that he had no issue with the building, but it was outside of the development boundary and in a rural area. He said he couldn't say he would be supporting the application. Councillor Patrick said he had concerns about photos being shown that had not been previously seen by officers or members. He said he did not feel it was good practice.

Councillor Parkinson said he was undecided. He commented that he did not think it would do any harm with just one dwelling.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he had listened to the debate and was going to support refusal of the application.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that there were reasons to support the application, such as it being an existing brownfield site, and that it was consistent with neighbouring development. He stated that he was not endorsing further development.

Mr Limmer said that he would recommend adding conditions regarding construction management plans, details of landscaping, and biodiversity scheme.

Councillor Lindley and Councillor Hudson agreed to the conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for and 4 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 9 - DM/0010/23/FUL - Land at Forest Way, Humberston.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought a variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) following DM/0159/22/FUL to amend house types for plots 3, 4, 6 and 7. Mr Dixon explained that the principle of the development had already been established under the original permission. He said that the applicant was asking to amend the house types for plots 3, 4, 6 and 7. He explained that the amendments proposed were for single storey rear extensions to be included with each of the plots. Mr Dixon stated that the dormer bungalows had already been approved and said that some confusion had been caused regarding the application. He reiterated that this was a variation application to include single storey rear extensions to the plots. Mr Dixon said that a good separation from neighbouring properties would be retained and said that it was not considered that there would be any negative impacts to neighbours. Mr Dixon said that the proposed amendments were acceptable and would not change the overall design concept or create a significant negative impact to neighbours or the wider area. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Patrick proposed that the application be approved with conditions as laid out in the report.

Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 10 – DM/1113/22/OUT - Pine Lodge, Waltham House Farm, Louth Road, Waltham.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it was an outline application with all matters reserved and sought to erect a dwelling with associated access. Mr Dixon said that the site was outside of the development boundary but that due to the fact the Council was not able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing, the application could be considered. Mr Dixon said the National Planning Policy Framework outlined that an application could be approved as long as the benefits of the application outweighed any negative impact the application would cause. Mr Dixon said that the principle of the dwelling being on this site would be considered acceptable as the site had already been used for residential purposes. Mr Dixon stated that further investigation would have to take place on the site regarding ecology prior to any construction work taking place. He said that the ecology officer was happy with the conditions proposed. Mr Dixon said that the Environmental Protection Officer had recommended conditions regarding construction hours and methods. He said the Highways Officer was happy with the application at the current stage. Mr Dixon stated that the site was not located in a flood risk area and therefore was considered an area for preferable residential development. Mr Dixon said that the Drainage Officer had also recommended conditions which had been included. Mr Dixon said that the application would not cause a negative impact on the character of the area or neighbouring amenity. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that part of the land was already in his client's garden. He said it was a self-contained area. Mr Deakins explained that it was an outline application and that more details would follow in the reserved matters stage. He said that an ecology report had been included and that further testing would take place, but they weren't able to test at the present time as species were out of season. Mr Deakins said that if committee members approved the application, that would not stop the testing taking place or further mitigation from being agreed. He reiterated that it would still happen. Mr Deakins explained that his client was fully aware and open minded regarding the application stage and the further stages that would follow.

Councillor Dawkins asked whether the site was located within the development boundary in the local plan.

The Chair clarified that it was not.

Councillor Lindley said that it was an outline application and that the ecology concerns raised would be considered prior to a full application being submitted. He said that he would not be supporting the application as the site was located outside of the local plan.

Councillor Hudson said that it was open countryside but that it had been determined by officers that there would not be an effect to amenities.

Councillor Patrick said that it was a nice open space but was outside the development boundary which he said he was concerned about. He commented that he was sceptical about approving outline permission and was minded toward refusing the application. He said the application could lead to a domino effect and could result in more pressure on the Toll Bar roundabout.

Councillor Lindley said that the site was outside of the local plan. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Mr Dixon sought clarification on the reasons for proposing refusal. He listed the fact that the site was in the open countryside, outside the local plan and the effect the application would have on the character of the area.

Councillor Lindley and Councillor Dawkins confirmed they were the reasons for proposing and seconding refusal of the application.

Councillor Beasant returned to the meeting midway through the debate on the application and abstained from the vote.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 9 for with 1 abstention for the application to be refused.)

Item 11 - DM/1066/22/FUL - Land Adj Field Gates, Post Office Lane, Ashby Cum Fenby.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it was asking for a variation of Condition 1 (Temporary permission) attached to DM/0513/21/FUL to continue to site a caravan for a further 18 months. Mr Dixon explained that the application was before the committee due to an objection from Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Council citing concern on the effect the application would have on the visual amenity. He said that the site was established for residential purposes and the siting of the caravan was on a temporary basis whilst the work was completed on a previously approved permission under DM/0513/21/FUL. Mr Dixon stated that the extension of the time period would not have an undue impact on the visual character of the area. Mr Dixon referred committee members to the supplementary agenda as an extra condition had been added to the application. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval for a limited time period.

Councillor Lindley said that there was nothing in the application that contradicted what the original decision was. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Patrick said that he was happy to support the application. He said that the temporary permission aspect was very important.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved for a limited time period.

(Note - the committee voted 9 for with 1 abstention for the application to be approved.)

Item 12 – DM/0840/22/OUT - Field House, Waltham Road, Brigsley.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it was an outline application that sought the erection of one dwelling and the provision of a new access with all matters reserved (amended description for clarity purposes highlighting access, layout, scale and landscaping for indicative details only). Mr Limmer explained that the site was located within the development boundary and that the site was currently a residential garden. Mr Limmer said that policy 5 did not prohibit this type of development. He said that the site was also not located within a flood risk area. Mr Limmer explained that the application was an outline application with considerations such as access, landscaping, layout and appearance being held for a future reserved matters submission. However, he said that some indicative details had been provided. He said that consideration at the current stage was regarding the principle of the residential development at the proposed site. Mr Limmer stated that due to the policies and the location, the development was acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer said that one dwelling on the site would not be seen as out of character for the area as the area was diverse in terms of density, design and appearance. He said that access to the site would be taken from Waltham Road utilizing the existing access point and that certain upgrades would need to be completed to allow this. Mr Limmer said that the Highways Officer was happy with the current plans. Mr Limmer said that the Drainage Officer had asked for a condition to be added regarding ground levels and no surface water run-off. Mr Limmer stated that there had been objections from neighbours citing concerns of the potential impact the development would have. He reiterated that the application was an outline application, and that consideration would be given to these concerns at the reserved matters stage. Mr Limmer stated that the application did show that there would be a sufficient separation from adjoining properties to ensure levels of privacy, light and sunlight would be maintained. Mr Limmer stated that a Tree Constraints Plan and Tree Survey had been provided and that further information regarding tree protection would be provided at the reserved matters stage. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and sections 5, 12, 14 and 15 of the National

Planning Policy Framework. Mr Limmer said that the application was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the site was within the development boundary. He said that the parish council had objected to the development. Mr Nelson said that a plan had been submitted regarding the access and that the owners of the access had not raised objections to the plan. Mr Nelson stated that the site was outside of the flood risk zone. He informed committee members that no technical objections had been raised. Mr Nelson said that he was aware that there had been objections raised from neighbours. He explained that he had looked at these and that certain changes had been made. Mr Nelson said that the dwelling would be single storey to limit overlooking and he stated that the scale of the bungalow would not cause massing. Mr Nelson said that there had been discussions with the Tree Officer regarding tree management and that an agreement of 7 metres in height had been reached which would allow light into gardens. Mr Nelson stated that all objections had been dealt with either through explanations in the officer's report or through planning conditions.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought the application was interesting. He commented that the parish council had objected on the grounds of ownership but said that committee did not consider ownership. He said that he didn't see an issue with the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe queried whether a condition could be added to enforce that it remained a bungalow.

Mr Limmer referred committee members to condition 8 outlined in the report.

Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Parkinson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 13 - DM/0571/22/FUL - 117 Fairway, Waltham.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to remove existing decking to the rear, alterations and to erect a rear two storey extension (amended plan received 16th December 2022 to reduce projection of first floor element). Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before committee due an objection from Waltham Parish Council relating to overshadowing and a loss of light. Mr Dixon said that the site was located within the development area for Waltham and that the principle of the development was acceptable as long as it did not cause significant issues. He said that the materials used would be similar to that of the existing dwelling and that the

existing dwelling would cover the extension from the street view. Mr Dixon explained that the extension being two-storey had initially caused concern but that the nature of the work and the proposed position of the extension was not unusual in a residential area. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been objected to by a neighbour. Mr Dixon said that the extension would be stepped back from the boundary shared with the neighbour. He explained that the neighbour had objected, citing concerns over the impact of light, overshadowing and the dominance caused. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been amended to reduce the impacts on light and although some impact would be caused this would not be considered detrimental due to the orientation of the properties. Mr Dixon said that the height of the proposed extension was acceptable. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. He said that the application was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hudson said that the committee had previously seen similar extensions to the one outlined in the plans. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he thought the extension seemed quite dominant to him and stated that he would not be supporting the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 9 for and 1 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 14 – DM/0610/22/OUT – Sunnyview, Carr Lane, Healing.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought an outline application to erect 5 dwellings with all matters reserved (amended plans and description October 2022). Mr Limmer said that the site was outside of the development boundary of Healing and was located in the open countryside. He said that the application could be considered as the council was unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing. Mr Limmer said that the benefits the proposal would bring must outweigh any negatives caused for the proposal to be acceptable. He said that the proposed site had been identified in the local plan maps as being part of the Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor between Healing and Great Coates. Mr Limmer said that the plans that had been submitted showed that the proposed 5 dwellings would be a clear intrusion into the open countryside. He said that the visual intrusion into the open countryside that the five dwellings would cause outweighed any benefits that 5 dwellings would bring into delivering housing in the area. He said that the site could accommodate the proposed 5 dwellings without unduly impacting upon residential

amenities but that more detail would need to be provided at the reserved matter stage if the application was approved by the committee. Mr Limmer said that the highways officer had objected to the application stating that Carr Lane could not accommodate an additional 5 dwellings and the traffic generation that would be caused by the development. He said that there were also concerns raised by the highways officer about future occupiers having to take their bins to northern end of Carr Lane as bin lorries do not travel down Carr Lane as it is not an adopted highway. Mr Limmer said that the highways officer had said that it would not be considered to be a good level of amenity. He said that the highways officers had also objected to the application due to the width of Carr Lane and that two vehicles would not be able to pass each other on the majority of the road. Mr Limmer stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 5, 22, 40 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the application had been very frustrating. He explained that the proposal was to replace a large house. Mr Deakins said that the application included a turning point which the residents would benefit from. He said that it was an outline application with all matters reserved. Mr Deakins explained that the highways aspect of the application was complicated. He stated that the road was of an adequate width for emergency vehicles and served the existing residents. Mr Deakins said that the road was part of the character of the area and that the maintenance of the road was done on an ad hoc basis which worked for the residents. He informed committee members that his client would accept a condition which required him to repair the road. Mr Deakins said that he had not seen any data from the Highways Department showing the danger. Mr Deakins said that he had provided the Highways Department with a report which he was not sure they had considered. He asked members to challenge highway officers on their objection to the application. Mr Deakins informed committee members that on the northern part of the site other developments had been approved. He said that highway officers had been inconsistent.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that it was his ward and that he was aware that most houses had two cars, and that the road was not wide enough for cars to pass each other. He said he also had concerns regarding bin collections. Councillor Hasthorpe said that he was aware of only one time that the road had had maintenance. He said that there were various reasons to refuse the application. Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Dawkins said that he agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe. He seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Hudson queried whether the report provided by the agent had been considered by the highways officer.

Ms Hattle stated that everything that had been provided had been assessed and that a site visit had taken place. She said that there were

currently 21 dwellings and this would make it 26 dwellings. Ms Hattle explained to committee members that refuse vehicles would not go down the road. She reiterated that the highway officer's recommendation was to refuse the application.

Councillor Patrick stated that he was initially minded to vote against the application but said that after hearing the agent speak, he was definitely going to vote against the application. He stated he was very concerned about adding extra dwellings to that area.

Councillor Lindley commented that safety was paramount and said that he would be voting to refuse the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe referred to a previous application where the access road had a similar width and the committee had voted against the application. He said the committee needed to be consistent.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he would be voting to refuse the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Councillor Pettigrew left the meeting at this point.

COUNCILLOR HASTHORPE IN THE CHAIR

Item 15 – DM/0679/22/FUL - Whitsend Farm, Thoroughfare, Ashby Cum Fenby.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect a detached dwelling with garages and associated works (business plan included December 2022). Mr Limmer stated that the site was outside of the development boundary for Ashby Cum Fenby and was located in the open countryside. Mr Limmer said that the site was located a considerable distance away from the village and said that there was no practical access to public transport and services. Mr Limmer said that there would need to be an exceptional reason to build new dwellings on open countryside in order to satisfy the requirements of policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. Mr Limmer said that a business case had been submitted by the applicant outlining the need for the dwelling in regard to agriculture. Mr Limmer said that the case had not been considered to be convincing and lacked detail. He stated that the proposal was not acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer said the proposed dwelling would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the countryside. Mr Limmer stated that there had been objections raised by neighbours citing concerns of loss of privacy and noise. He explained that the site was of a sufficient size and would be located a significant distance away from neighbouring properties. Mr Limmer stated that the application was not in accordance with policy 5

of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Wilson spoke as the applicant. He said that his family had owned the land since the early 1970s. He commented that he had recently purchased more land to be able to expand his business. Mr Wilson explained that due to situations such as animal welfare, someone had to be on the site all the time. He said that he currently was living three miles away and he explained that it was not good business practice to be travelling to and from. He said that he was currently averaging 48 miles a day. Mr Wilson stated that planning policies should support the rural economy.

Councillor Dawkins said that he was unsure when he first looked at the application, but he said he thought the application would help the applicant with his farm. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hudson stated that the neighbours support the application and that he thought that having the dwelling would help the applicant with travelling. He seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Croft said that she thought it would be a big improvement to the area and said that the application was for security reasons. She said that she would vote in support of the application.

Councillor Patrick said that he was minded to oppose the application as it was in the open countryside. He commented that it was good to see that the farm was successful but said he was concerned about a precedent being set.

Councillor Hudson commented that there were houses close by and that the dwelling would not be completely isolated.

Mr Dixon said that the applicant understood that there had to be special justification to approve the application. He said he recommended that a temporary caravan be allowed as part of a stepped approach. He said it was important to be sure about an application.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he agreed with Councillor Patrick and Mr Dixon and said he thought it was appropriate to start with a temporary caravan.

Councillor Patrick said that there had been two refusals in the past. He said he was concerned about a domino effect.

Councillor Hudson stated that the committee had approved several applications for the Ashby Cum Fenby area. He said that the applicant had been there since the 1970s. He said he viewed the site as almost a brownfield site.

Councillor Patrick said that he appreciated the point Councillor Hudson had made but commented that he personally had not approved the applications in Ashby Cum Fenby.

Mr Limmer outlined the conditions that he recommended.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for and 4 against for the application to be approved.)

Councillor Pettigrew returned to the meeting at this point.

COUNCILLOR PETTIGREW IN THE CHAIR

Item 16 - DM/0662/22/FUL - 1b Humberston Avenue, Humberston.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought to convert an existing garage to store, erect a single storey garden room at the rear of the garden to include a gym room, hot tub room and store. He said that the application also sought to erect a detached four car garage to front, erect a perimeter boundary wall and undertake alterations to the existing access with a double gate and various associated external alterations. Mr Limmer said that the proposed garden room building to the rear and the proposed garage to the front of the property would dominate the outlook and infringe on the enjoyment of the recreational areas to the detriment of residents due to their position, size and scale. He also said that the design and scale of the proposed garage would detract from the appearance of the property and the character of Humberston Avenue. Mr Limmer stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that there had been no objection raised from the village council. Mr Nelson said that new brick wall would be put in and that the garage to the front of property would be for his clients use only. He said that all houses in the area were designed differently and that this was part of the charm of Humberston Avenue. He said that the application had been given local support.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement provided by Councillor Shreeve and Councillor Harness.

The statement read that the resident had contacted ward councillors with concerns and that a site had subsequently taken place. The application was to build a replacement garage to the right front of the property, a recreation structure to the rear of the property and to construct a perimeter wall in brick. The statement read that pedestrians in Humberston Avenue would be unaware of the extensions as they would not be visible from the road. Following small changes made to the plan regarding the roof's pitch and height, the application received

the support of neighbours to either side and to the rear of the property, and the village council had no objections. The statement read that the concerns regarding the building line were, in the ward councillors view, irrelevant as the building line was not within sight of Humberston Avenue, and neighbouring properties lines were not uniform.

Councillor Hudson stated that he did initially agree with the officer's recommendation but having seen that the parish council, neighbours and ward councillors were not objecting to the application, he was happy to move for the approval of the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he had declared an interest regarding the application. He explained that he had visited the premises and thought that the applicant had done a good job on improving the site. He seconded the motion to approve the application.

Mr Limmer said that if committee members were minded to approve the application, he recommended conditions on time limits, surface water drainage, construction materials and construction management plan.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 8 for and 2 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 17 – DM/0745/21/FUL - Cartergate Car Park, Chantry Lane, Grimsby.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought the removal of Condition 1 Temporary Consent) pursuant to DM/0168/20/FUL to retain the car park with a proposed new attendants hut and associated works to resurface the car park and add landscaping. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the committee as it was a departure from the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. He said that the site was allocated for housing but that policy 13 did not restrict other development. Mr Dixon stated that the planning guidance had also changed and had made it clear that local authorities should not keep granting temporary consents and should instead establish whether a proposed use of the land was suitable on a permanent basis. Mr Dixon said that the Highways Officer had visited the site and reviewed the amended plans and had raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon said that the site had been used as a car park for a long time and allowing the site to be used as car park on a permanent use permission would not prejudice the sites allocation. Mr Dixon said that the plans outlined in the application would improve the appearance of the site. He said that the matters regarding drainage and tree management would be conditioned. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the approval of the application.

Councillor Hudson seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that he would be supporting the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 9 for 1 against for the application to be approved.)

P.74 PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure under delegated powers during the period 19th January – 16th February 2023

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.75 PLANNING APPEALS

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.76 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.77 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 2.40 p.m.