



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 12th December 2024

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2nd October 2024 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright, Emmerson, Goodwin, Hudson, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Parkinson, Patrick, Pettigrew and Shutt

Officers in attendance:

- Hannah Steer (Solicitor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Lara Hattle Fitzgerald (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Richard Limmer (Senior Town Planner)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Clough (Heneage Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Crofts (Immingham Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Harness (Humberston and New Waltham Ward Councillor)

There were 24 members of the public present and one member of the press.

P.31 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies received for this meeting.

P.32 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bright declared a pecuniary interest in P.33 Item 3 as he was a member of the Humberston Fitties Tenancy Group.

Item 1 - DM/0329/24/FULA – 22 South Marsh Road, Stallingborough

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the erection of extensions to the front and rear of the property including raising the roof height to create first floor accommodation and installation of front and rear dormers. He said that the application also included the demolition of an existing garage and front boundary wall and the erection of a new detached garage to the rear. The application also sought retrospective planning permission for a new boundary wall with pillars and gates to the front of the site. He said that the application had previously been considered by the Planning Committee where it was subsequently deferred to allow for a site visit to take place. Mr Limmer stated that a site visit for committee members had now taken place. He said that the application site was located within the development area of Stallingborough and was acceptable in principle subject to there being no significant issues. Mr Limmer said that whilst what was proposed was quite a change, it was considered that the proposed development would not cause an adverse impact to the character and appearance of the area. Mr Limmer said that objections to the development had been received from some neighbours regarding overshadowing and privacy concerns. He said that the applicant had undertaken a light test which showed that although the proposed development would mean increase in height, there would be no issues in terms of overshadowing. Mr Limmer stated that the combination of the proposed extensions and the increase in the roof height would significantly increase the overall size of the existing dwelling. He said that the extension and the raised roof would be directly along and close to the boundary shared with no.24 South Marsh Road. Mr Limmer stated that would result in dominance and massing and would cause an undue impact on the residential amenity of no.24 South Marsh Road. He said that no objections to the application had been raised by the council's highways officer. Mr Limmer said that the council's drainage officer had also raised no objections to the application. He said that the issue of dominance and massing on the neighbouring property remained. 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.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of the objector Ms Wiseman.

Ms Wiseman wrote that she stood by her objection to the proposed huge extension to number 22 South Marsh Road due to the reasons the application was rejected initially, which was that the over massing and dominance would be detrimental to neighbouring residential amenities and contrary to policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. Ms Wiseman wrote that policy 5 was instated to stop over massing and dominance on homes such as hers and she hoped that the Planning Committee would abide by their first decision and reject the application to have the bungalow

mutilated into a mammoth adobe which would dramatically affect the natural light she enjoyed at the moment and had done over the last 25 years. She wrote that she did not want to have lights on during the day because a neighbour's extension had intruded upon her and restricted her right to light. Ms Wiseman wrote in her statement that she would like to remind the Planning Committee of the legal precedent set out in the Prescription Act 1832, in particular the 20-year rule. She wrote that the legislation stated that 'if a property has enjoyed uninterrupted access to natural light for a period of 20 years or more, the right to that light becomes protected'. Ms Wiseman said that given her home had benefitted from such light for over 20 years, any sort of obstruction caused by this massive extension would be a violation of that right. Ms Wiseman wrote that beyond the legal implications, the obstruction of light would also affect the liveability of her home. She wrote that she also had major concerns regarding the privacy of her bathroom and that the right to privacy was a fundamental aspect of living comfortably in one's home. Ms Wiseman wrote that the thought that we may be seen in the bath due to the neighbour's bedroom windows being in very close proximity was horrendous.

Mr Bonner spoke in support of the application. He said that the height of the neighbouring properties on either side of the bungalow was eight metres and ten metres. Mr Bonner said that the height of the proposed development would be eight metres and therefore was not excessive in comparison. He said that both neighbours had recently been granted planning permission for development. Mr Bonner said that any overshadowing onto number 24 as a result of development at number 22 would be less than the overshadowing that number 20 had on number 22 and that had been considered acceptable. Mr Bonner said that planning permission was granted for number 20 and this application should also be considered acceptable. He stated that he saw no reason for the Planning Committee to reject the application and it should be duly accepted.

Mr Singh spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that his house was a lot lower in height than that of his neighbour's properties. Mr Singh said that he was surrounded by properties that were ten metres in height and his was only five. He stated that the proposed development would give his property a presence in the street and make the street scene look better. Mr Singh said that his windows faced onto his neighbour's property, and he had to have his curtains shut which impacted upon his privacy. He said that a light test had been undertaken which showed that the proposed development would not cause issues of overshadowing.

Councillor Crofts spoke as the Ward Councillor for the Immingham Ward. He said that he hoped the site visit had made obvious the situation. Councillor Crofts said twice in the officer's report there was mention of the application being acceptable for policy 5. He said that only when the impact on residential amenity was outlined in the officer's report, was it then that the application was considered unacceptable for policy 5 due to massing and dominance. Councillor Crofts said that there was a recent new build at number 24 which was allowed, and he would have hoped for

some consistency. He felt that it was not consistent to refuse the application. Councillor Crofts understood the concerns raised about the window but right to light was not an acceptable objection. He said that he thought planning officers had considered the application as a one off, but they also needed to look at other residential properties in the area. Councillor Crofts asked committee members to reconsider the application and approve it.

Councillor Hudson said that the planning application for number twenty was recommended for refusal by officers but was approved by the Planning Committee. Councillor Hudson said that it was a difficult decision due to the flood risk issue. He said that he thought the proposed development would be detrimental to the neighbour at number twenty-four. Councillor Hudson said that he was not only concerned about the issue of massing but also how the proposed development could be built as he would think that to do so, you would have to go onto the neighbour's land. He stated that he thought it would be better had the applicant decided to build a new house, but he understood that if they did so, then planning officers would probably recommend refusal on grounds of flood risk. Councillor Hudson said that he thought it was a shame that the property couldn't be moved back. He said that he thought the right to light argument was correct and that there was legislation regarding a twenty-year rule. Councillor Hudson said that the proposed development would look nice, but neighbours would suffer as a result. He said that he agreed with the planning officer's recommendation. Councillor Hudson said that if the application were refused, hopefully there would be a new application submitted which was further back and away from the fence which would be more suitable. He said that he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Bright said that the proposed development was acceptable in principle and was acceptable in terms of the impact on character of the area. He stated that there were no issues regarding highways and that the only issue was the impact on residential amenity. Councillor Bright said that the officer's report stated that the proposed development had passed a light test but had recommended refusal due to dominance and massing issues. Councillor Bright stated that consistency was important and there was a large, detached property next door that was ten metres tall which was not recommended for refusal on grounds of massing and dominance when it was proposed. He said that if that application was considered acceptable, then the same should be said for the current application. Councillor Bright queried whether a standard was used in determining whether a proposed development was detrimental due to massing and dominance or whether it was from officers' experience that they determined that.

Mr Dixon responded that massing and dominance were terms used in the planning process to describe effects on neighbouring properties. He said that issues of massing and dominance were determined by the officer's experience in planning.

Councillor Bright sought clarification that the determination of massing and dominance was subjective.

Mr Dixon stated that planning could be subjective. He said that planning officers' judgement was their professional opinion. Mr Dixon stated that planning officers believed that the proposed development would cause adverse impacts on the neighbour's residential amenity due to issues of massing and dominance.

Councillor Bright said that the apex of the roof would slope away from the property next door. He said that he was inclined to support approval of the application.

Councillor Shutt said that the neighbour's property had to be high due to the flood risk. He said that he went on the site visit and thought that there could be overlooking. Councillor Shutt said that the Planning Committee had to make difficult decisions and based on the history, he thought it would be unfair for the applicant to not be allowed to build the proposed development.

Councillor Hudson said that the neighbours used to have an open view around them and had now lost the view at the back and had nearly lost the side view and would therefore be completely overshadowed. Councillor Hudson said that he thought there could be a compromise but only if the current application was refused. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Parkinson said that applications like the current one, were always difficult as you felt as though you were taking sides, and he didn't want to do that. He said that he thought the proposed development would be dominant and would affect the light. Councillor Parkinson said that it was a shame about the positioning of the building. He said that he sadly had to agree with the proposal of refusal. Councillor Parkinson said that he understood people's concerns regarding number twenty, and it did look tall but didn't look to be in the way like the proposed development would be. Councillor Parkinson seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that, unfortunately, she could not attend the site visit, but after having listened to Councillor Crofts, she was going to propose that the application be approved. She said that it appeared that there was overshadowing anyway due to the new builds, and if they were approved, then she couldn't understand why the current application shouldn't be.

Councillor Patrick said that he was leaning towards supporting the application. He said that one would assume whilst subjective that dominance and massing was based on the surrounding area. Councillor Patrick said that the issue of massing and dominance fell below the threshold for him in the application being refused. He queried the references made to legislation from 1832 and whether that impacted the planning process.

Mr Dixon said that right to light was a legal issue, and there was a whole plethora of legislation related to that. He said that the Planning Committee should not make judgements based on right to light legislation.

Councillor Patrick sought clarification that the legislation that had been referred to was not planning legislation.

Mr Dixon confirmed that was correct.

Councillor Lindley said that he had not been able to attend the site visit. He said that the application was a tricky one to consider and he thought the Planning Committee was suffering the consequence of their own decision by approving number twenty's application. Councillor Lindley said that he was struggling to decide on the application. He queried whether right to light was a material consideration for refusing a planning application. Councillor Lindley said that he thought compensation could be granted if right of light was breached.

Mr Dixon stated that light was an issue under the planning process, but right to light was a separate process and was instead a specific issue that there was legislation for, and if a person felt that their right to light had been breached, they could put in a claim, but that was a separate process.

Councillor Parkinson said that he thought light tests were carried out by planning officers as part of the process, but he hadn't heard about them being done in a while.

Mr Dixon said that light tests were carried out and one was undertaken for the current application and was passed. Mr Dixon clarified that the light test was not a right to light test. He said that loss of light was not the reason that the application was recommended for refusal, and that the issues were instead massing and dominance.

Councillor Parkinson said that massing and dominance could impact light.

Mr Dixon reiterated that right to light as a legal process was not a consideration of the Planning Committee.

Councillor Parkinson said that there was a reasonable gap between number twenty and twenty-two, but not so much with the current property and the neighbouring property.

Ms Steer clarified that right to light was similar to covenants and was not a material planning consideration. She said that right to light was dealt with under a separate process.

Councillor Emmerson said that lots of valid points had been raised and he had sympathy for the neighbours. He thought it was a modern overdevelopment of the village and the building would look more like a

business venue. He said that he would be supporting the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Lindley thanked Ms Steer for clarifying the issue of right to light. He said that what was proposed was a significant development and he thought it was a step too far. Councillor Lindley said that the applicant could come back with something else where there was no overshadowing. He said that he would be supporting the proposal of refusal.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for and 5 against for the application to be refused.)

Item 2 - DM/0353/24/REM - Land South Side of Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought permission for the variation of condition one to amend the site layout and house types on phases eight, nine and ten of the development. Mr Limmer said that the application also sought permission for the variation of conditions two, three, four and five to be reworded as compliance conditions following DM/1005/16/REM. He said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Limmer said that the principle of the development had been established through the previous permission for application DM/107/12/HUM which was allowed at appeal and under the permission for application DM/1005/16/REM for the reserved matters. He stated that the current application did not affect that established principle of development. Mr Limmer said that a number of objections had been received as well as a petition. He said that the concerns raised were regarding the impact on traffic generation, highway safety and the impact on neighbouring amenities. Mr Limmer said that some concerns had been raised by neighbours regarding the highway link through the development being joined up and what the impact of that would be. Mr Limmer stated that it was always planned that, that road would be joined up and had been a part of the site master plan and was approved in the reserved matters stage of the development. He said that the current application did not seek to change that. Mr Limmer said that the overall layout would remain the same, but the proposed bungalows would instead be houses in phases nine and ten. He explained that due to the separation distances between the now proposed houses and the neighbouring properties, the amendment would not cause a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. Mr Limmer said that the proposed amendments would change the appearance of the development, but the proposed house types were similar to those built in the other phases of the development. He stated that the overall height of phase nine would be increased but would not exceed the scale of earlier phases of the development. Mr Limmer said that the proposed materials to be used were considered acceptable. He said that an updated landscaping scheme had been submitted by the applicant and had been found to be

acceptable by officers. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed amendments would not harm the character and appearance of the area. He said that the council's drainage officer had raised no concerns with the application and the condition included on the original outline application remained. Mr Limmer said that the council's highways officer had raised no objection to the application. He explained that the applicant was in the process of agreeing to a section 38 Highway Agreement regarding the adoption of the roads. Mr Limmer said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Sparling spoke in objection to the application. She said that she was speaking on behalf of residents. Ms Sparling said that she had concerns over the viability of Blackthorne Avenue if a further 107 properties were to be built. Ms Sparling stated that if they were built that would bring the total number of properties on the development to 400 and would mean an increase in the volume of road traffic. She said that residents from Meadow West might also want to use the access on Blackthorne Avenue as an alternative to Alder Avenue. Ms Sparling said that 600 cars could make 700 plus journeys per day. She said that the traffic flow on Blackthorne Drive was minimal but there were still parking issues and issues of speeding. Ms Sparling said that the Carrington Gardens entrance was from Blackthorne Avenue and it zig-zagged at ninety degrees both ways. She stated that there was the distinct possibility of serious accidents occurring due to careless driving around the bends and there being no road signs or markings on any of the junctions. Ms Sparling said that double yellow lines were to be painted on as a child safety initiative, which would enable buses, but she asked where would the parents park. She said that there would be double yellow lines, delivery vans, parents dropping off their children and picking them up, buses, children on bikes and everything stopping and starting. Ms Sparling stated that the junction would become a serious black spot. She said that her and the petitioners would like to suggest a 20mph limit on the site and around the school and double yellow lines on the righthand side of Blackthorne Avenue. Ms Sparling said that the petition also proposed that the total number of houses on the development be divided into sections with 179 houses to the east and 131 houses to the west with properties to the east using the Alder Avenue access and properties to the west using the Blackthorne Avenue access. Ms Sparling said that safety should come first, and Blackthorne Avenue would not be able to support an increase in the level of traffic without it dangerously compromising safety. She stated that a site visit would be beneficial for the Planning Committee, so members could be satisfied they were making the right decision.

Mr Lane spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the application sought minor amendments to an already approved reserved matters application. Mr Lane stated that the layout would remain the same with the house types changed. He said that there were no material objections from any consultees. Mr Lane said that he had worked with

the council and had provided information in relation to landscaping and the right of way. He stated that the application was recommended for approval by the council's planning officers. Mr Lane said that concerns had been raised by residents, in relation to car parking, school drop off's and safety. He said that residents had suggested splitting the site into two, and the applicant has met with the resident's group but could not have a two access system with the site split up. Mr Lane stated that the applicant had put up signs saying no parking to address concerns. He said that the applicant had also expressed willingness to work with the council regarding any issues. Mr Lane said that the access arrangements were in place but were not to do with the application being considered. He said that the roads weren't all adopted yet so lines were not in place, but this was a matter of time. Mr Lane said that the applicant was not proposing any changes to the access arrangements. He said that for a development of 400 dwellings, two access points were required as per highways guidance and this had been done. Mr Lane said that residents had suggested that the issue of traffic volume had worsened but the Department of Transport monitor traffic volumes and there was less volume than what was forecast. He said that the access arrangements were appropriate and that it was important for the Planning Committee to note that the council's Highways Department had reviewed the application and raised no objections. Mr Lane said that he hoped the Planning Committee could support the application.

Councillor Harness spoke as the Ward Councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He said that he was present to support residents. Councillor Harness said that residents had concerns relating to the density of the development road layout. He said that he had spoken with Mr Limmer who had told him the objections raised by residents could not be supported under the planning criteria. Councillor Harness said that he was informed that developments with 150 dwellings required one access and developments with over 250 dwellings needed two. He said after hearing this information, he did inform the residents of what Mr Limmer had said and that the Planning Committee would have to take that into account. Councillor Harness said that he gave residents the opportunity to step back and not speak at the meeting, but they are made of stern stuff and wanted to be heard. He stated that he was present to support residents. Councillor Harness said that when the outline application was approved on appeal, there was no on-site residents, but this had now progressed, and the care home was now there. He said that once the development was completed, the site would be one and would be served by both Blackthorne Avenue and Alder Avenue. Councillor Harness said that he thought it seemed smart to split the site into two sites with a link barrier. He said that this would limit further traffic. Councillor Harness asked committee members to undertake a site visit.

Councillor Hudson said that the houses would be built, the application was simply a change in the design. He said that there was not a lot the Planning Committee could do. Councillor Hudson said that there were two access points as required, and what was proposed was a minor

change. He stated that he would support a proposal of a site visit if the committee members thought one was needed.

Councillor Bright said that the original scheme was approved but objections had been raised regarding highways. He queried whether highways officers had concerns about the development.

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald said that highways officers had considered the application and two access points were needed, and this had been achieved. She stated that the Highways Department did not have any concerns.

Councillor Bright said that there was a demographic of elderly people in the specific area. He queried whether there was any specific highways guidance for areas where a lot of elderly people live.

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald responded that there was no specific guidance.

Councillor Bright said that he would support a proposal of a site visit, although was not sure how much a site visit would change things but would like to understand the concerns raised by residents.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be deferred to allow for a site visit to take place.

Councillor Bright seconded the proposal to defer the application to allow for a site visit to take place.

Councillor Patrick said that he was against the proposal of deferment to allow for a site visit. He said that whilst it was important to consider any objections raised, he thought a site visit would give residents false optimism. Councillor Patrick stated that he didn't think the Planning Committee could do much regarding the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he did not want to give false hope to residents. He said that concerns had been raised but highways found the development to be acceptable. Councillor Shutt said that the concerns were between objectors and highways. He stated that he did not think having a site visit would do anything.

Councillor Goodwin queried whether the section 38 process would alleviate any concerns raised by residents.

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald said that once the road was adopted, if concerns were then raised, it could be reviewed. She said that double yellow lines could potentially be considered at that time. Ms Hattle Fitzgerald said that at present, it was up to the developer to deal with any issues until the road was adopted.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to allow for a site visit to take place.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for and 5 against for the application to be deferred.)

Councillor Bright left the meeting at this point.

Item 3 – DM/0495/24/FUL – Community Office, Humberston Fitties, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for a change of use from an existing community use to a mixed community and office use. He said that the application also sought permission for the erection of single storey extensions to the front and side elevations and associated internal and external works including the creation of car parking spaces. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He said that the community office was located in the Humberston Fitties Conservation Area within the resort area of Cleethorpes. Mr Dixon said that the development was acceptable in principle. He explained that the materials for the proposed extensions and alterations were considered acceptable with regard to the Humberston Fitties Chalet Design Guide. Mr Dixon said that the design of the proposed development was considered to be good and would provide a betterment to the existing building. He said that the council's heritage officer had raised no objection to the application following revisions being made to the initial scheme. Mr Dixon said that most of the objections were submitted prior to the revised scheme being submitted and some of the objections raised regarded the previous materials that were proposed. He reiterated that the revised scheme now proposed materials that were considered acceptable. Mr Dixon stated that in relation to the impact the proposed development would have on the neighbouring chalets, it was considered that it would not be detrimental in terms of scale, location and the nature of the extensions and alterations proposed. Mr Dixon said that the council's environmental health officer had raised no objection to the application but had requested a condition be added regarding construction hours. He said that the application site was located within a flood zone 3 area but, due to the minor nature of the development, that it was also a change of use and that the proposed use was considered a less vulnerable use, a sequential test hadn't needed to be undertaken. Mr Dixon said that the council's drainage officer had raised no objection to the application. Mr Dixon said that concerns regarding ecology had been raised by objectors. He explained that the council's ecology officer had not raised any objections to the application but had requested an informative regarding standing advice for bats and birds. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 12, 22, 33, 34, 39 and 42 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 there had been no permanent base on site for employees and that residents used

to have to ring up if they needed to speak to someone. Mr Deakins said that a permanent presence was needed as new residents were used to speaking to someone on site. He said that that use had now grown, and several members of staff were to be on site. Mr Deakins said that the rest of the building would be a community space, with the applicant wanting a room for residents to use. He said that he agreed with the planning officer's report. Mr Deakins said that the Humberston Fitties Design Guide had been adhered to and the application was a simple proposal and was in scale with its surroundings.

Councillor Hudson said that there was clearly a genuine need for the development, and he thought the development would be an improvement to the building and would look much nicer. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson and that it was a simple proposal. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he supported the application.

Councillor Patrick said that he was very supportive of the application, and he couldn't fathom a reason to object to it. He queried the objection raised regarding the need for public toilets due to anti-social behaviour at the Humberston Fitties.

Mr Dixon said that it was an objection that had been received.

Councillor Shutt would have liked to see secure cycle parking included in the application. He queried whether that could be conditioned.

Mr Dixon said that it could be but might be a bit over the top. He suggested that it could be included in the application as an informative.

Councillor Shutt agreed to this.

Councillor Hudson and Councillor Pettigrew agreed to that being added as an informative.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Bright returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 4 – DM/0245/24/FUL – 166 Weelsby Road, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission to erect two dwellings with garages and various associated works. He said that the application had been brought before the Planning

Committee due to a call in from the Ward Councillor, Councillor Clough. Mr Dixon said that the application site was located outside of the development boundary and was therefore considered to be open countryside. He said that in order for development outside of the development boundary to be acceptable, it had to satisfy certain criteria. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed development did not satisfy the criteria and therefore was not acceptable in principle. He explained that due to the open aspect of the area and the proximity to heritage assets, the physical intrusion of two dwellings at the application site would be detrimental to the heritage and character and the setting of the nearby heritage assets. Mr Dixon said that the council's heritage officer had objected to the application. He stated that the archaeological value of the application site had not been evaluated and this contributed to the overall heritage concerns. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had done a lot of work to address concerns raised and had worked with the council's trees officer who was now satisfied with the application. He stated that the council's ecology officer had also raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon said that there had been no neighbour objections received, and the proposed development would be well screened due to the landscaping. He said that the proposed development would not have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties. Mr Dixon said that following discussions with the council's highways officer, the applicant had amended the original scheme. He stated that the council's highways officer was now satisfied with the application. Mr Dixon said that the council's drainage officer had raised no objection to the application but had required a condition be included with the application for ground infiltration tests. Mr Dixon stated that the issue of the principle of the development remained. He said that the proposed development would cause a detriment to the setting of the open character of the area and would have an undue impact on nearby heritage assets. Mr Dixon said that the application was not in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Councillor Clough spoke as the Ward Councillor for the Heneage Ward. She said that she had called in the application following a site visit. Councillor Clough said that both officers and the applicant had put due diligence into the application. She said that the applicant loved living where she lived and didn't want to intrude on that but felt isolated in the area. Councillor Clough said that the applicant wanted to build a hamlet. She stated that there had also been anti-social behaviour in the area. Councillor Clough said that Natural England had put forward no objection. She said that the proposed development would not have a substantial impact and that the scheme had been amended as initially three dwellings were proposed whereas now it was just two. Councillor Clough said that the proposed development was in keeping with the site and would not affect neighbour's vistas or the trees. She stated that the applicant was more than happy for a site visit to take place. Councillor Clough said that due diligence had taken place and compromises reached. She asked the Planning Committee to consider a site visit.

Councillor Bright said that the design of the proposed development was fantastic. He said that the application site was outside of the development boundary and therefore shouldn't be considered by the Planning Committee, unless there were exceptional circumstances. Councillor Bright said that if developments outside the development boundary were allowed, and development kept on creeping, it would eat into our green space. He said that there were strong heritage objections to the application. Councillor Bright said that he would listen to the debate but did not think the Planning Committee could approve the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that the application site was not a brownfield site and was outside of the development boundary. He said that the application site also formed part of a strategic gap. Councillor Emmerson queried whether highways officers had visited the site at different times of the day. He said that this was the wrong place for the development. Councillor Emmerson said that he did not think an animal welfare impact assessment had been undertaken.

Councillor Hudson said that it would be a nice place to live but was outside of the development boundary. He said that the application site was located on nice park land and park land was in short supply. Councillor Hudson said that to allow development outside of the development boundary to take place, there needed to be really good reasons, and this development didn't meet that standard.

Councillor Lindley said that it was a unique site and a very historical site that was of archaeological value. He said that there were heritage concerns, and he did not want to see diggers and builders going in due to those concerns. Councillor Lindley said that the proposed development looked nice but was outside of the development boundary. He said that he would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that it would be a nice place to live but was a historical special place. He said that he did not think the application site should be built on. Councillor Parkinson said that he agreed with the officer's recommendation outlined in their report.

Councillor Goodwin said that it was a difficult one as she liked the design of the houses but was concerned over the trees that some could be cut down by mistake. She said that she understood the applicant wanting there to be houses so she did not feel isolated and also to address anti-social behaviour concerns, but her concerns about the trees remained.

Councillor Shutt said that he took on board that a lot of work had been put into the application. He said that some concerns had been mitigated against. Councillor Shutt said that a good design had been proposed but the proposed development would not be in the right place. He said that he understood concerns about anti-social behaviour and also understood the applicant's passion to stay there and make it more secure. However,

Councillor Shutt said that there were secure places elsewhere and he could not support the application.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Lindey seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Councillor Emmerson left the meeting at this point.

Item 5 – DM/0323/24/FUL – Freshney Cottage, Post Office Lane, Ashby-Cum-Fenby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission to erect a single storey extension to the side and rear of existing storage buildings within the rear garden of an existing dwelling. He said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Council. Mr Dixon said that the application site was located within the development area of Ashby Cum Fenby and was acceptable in principle as long as the proposed development would not result in significant issues in terms of residential amenity and that the design was considered acceptable. He explained that the proposed extension would be built using brickwork and would have a pantile roof, similar in appearance to the existing storage buildings. Mr Dixon said that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. He said that concerns such as overshadowing and ownership issues had been raised by the neighbour. Mr Dixon said that a planning officer had visited the neighbour, and amendments had been made to the scheme. He said that a boundary hedge would be removed to accommodate the proposed extension but the 1.8m high boundary fence would be retained. Mr Dixon stated that the council's trees officer and council's ecology officer had not raised any objections to the removal of the boundary hedge. He said that the proposed extension would pitch away from neighbouring properties and that there would be no adverse massing. Mr Dixon explained that due to the distance between the proposed extension and the neighbour's property, there would also not be any adverse overshadowing issues. He said that the drawings submitted showed that the proposed extension would be located within the ownership of the applicant. Mr Dixon said that the proposed extension would be of a reasonable scale and would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbour's residential amenity. He said that there were no concerns regarding flooding as the application site was not located within a flood risk area. Mr Dixon stated that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application, but conditions were included as part of the application. Mr Dixon said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33 and 34 of the

North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of the applicant Mr Griffin.

Mr Griffin wrote that the proposal was for essentially a new garage/store joined onto existing outbuildings, which were to be renovated. The property did already have a single garage which was to be re-roofed and some modest outbuildings which were used for the washing machine, freezer, and a log store. Mr Griffin wrote in his statement that the current outbuildings had a very shallow lean-to style roof which had been leaking for some time and the idea was to replace it with a pitched roof which would stand the test of time. He wrote that the main part of the proposal was to build an additional garage/store and that this was mainly to house a vintage Fergie tractor which would be restored to its former glory. Mr Griffin wrote that he would also like some ploughing attachments, and it should also provide room for a second vehicle. He wrote that the garage would be accessed by the existing gravel driveway which would be extended to meet the new building. Mr Griffin wrote that the rainwater would be discharged into rainwater butts which would be used in the garden. He wrote that the building would be 1.5 metres away from the neighbouring property and the pitched roof would be angled away to not impact on any light and there would also be high level dormer style windows in the roof but nothing at a low level. Mr Griffin wrote that Freshney Cottage was one of the oldest houses in Ashby cum Fenby, and he intended to do justice to the age of the property with old style brick and a pantile roof. He wrote in his statement that the log store was essential for the property as the sole heating was through a biomass log boiler. Mr Griffin wrote that there was approximately half an acre of garden of which a good proportion was vegetable plot, orchard and chickens. He wrote that he felt that the extra storage space the proposal would create would help keep him moving forward in this way of life.

The Chair queried whether a condition could be added to the application that there be no residential occupants in the building.

Mr Dixon responded that planning permission would be required to allow for residential occupants in the outbuilding and therefore a condition was not needed.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he saw no reason to refuse the application. He said that it was a perfectly logical extension to the property. Councillor Kaczmarek proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that the building would be single storey and would be used to store a tractor. He said that the building would not be seen from the road and would not impact the existing garage. Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that it was a simple outbuilding being proposed and would be used to store a tractor. He said that it was well separated from the neighbour's boundary. Councillor Pettigrew said that he thought the issues with the neighbour had been resolved. He stated that he would support the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Bright said that the objection from the parish council was with regard to insufficient information being provided and issues regarding land ownership. He said that as those issues had been resolved, he saw no reason to not approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Emmerson returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 6 - DM/0852/23/FUL – 142–144 Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for a change of use from a doctor's surgery to two residential dwellings to include the removal of the external rear stairs with associated internal and external works. He stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from the Ward Councillor, Councillor Farren. Mr Limmer said that whilst the application site was located within the development boundary of Cleethorpes, it was also located within flood zone three and an area of breach hazard as identified in the council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Mr Limmer said that the Environment Agency had highlighted that the change of use from a doctor's surgery to residential dwellings would represent an increase in risk to people due to the associated long term and overnight accommodation. He said that the applicant had provided a Flood Risk Assessment which the Environment Agency then subsequently responded to, and the document was revised. However, the Environment Agency had maintained their objection. He said that therefore the application was not acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer stated that the external changes to the rear that were proposed were considered to be acceptable and there were no design issues. He said that the proposed development would not be detrimental to neighbouring residential amenity. Mr Limmer stated that an objection had been received citing concerns that the dwellings would be used as houses of multiple occupancy. That was not what was proposed, and the buildings would be used as two residential dwellings. Mr Limmer said that the objection from the Environment Agency remained regarding flood risk. He said that the application was not in accordance with policies 5 and 33 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Crest spoke on behalf of the applicant for the application. He said that he believed that the application had got bogged down in red tape because

of an objection from a neighbour on non-planning grounds. Mr Crest said that the application was submitted with the council on 31st August 2023 with target date for determination being 26th October 2023. He said that an extension was then given until the 15th December 2023 which was ten months ago. Mr Crest stated that it should have been a simple application, as it was for a change of use from a doctor's surgery to two residential terraced houses and minimal changes were made. He said that the main change was the external staircase, which was proposed to be removed. Mr Crest said that no structural changes were made, and none proposed to return the two houses, back to their original use. He said that the only one objection made regarding the application, was a suggestion that it would become a house of multiple occupation. Mr Crest said that this had never been envisaged and the planning officers report clarified that it had not been applied for and was irrelevant. He stated that he believed that flagged up the possibility of sleeping downstairs. Mr Crest said that sleeping downstairs could be done in every other house in the area now without recourse to planning. He said that if the two houses were forced to have the floor raised it would mean sleeping on the ground floor because that was the only floor there would be. Mr Crest said that if the application were approved as applied for, and the Planning Committee applied the conditions in the Flood Risk Assessment, then the two houses would be the best protected houses in the area. He said that the Environment Agency required that the floor be lifted 1.3 metres and unfortunately that would not comply with building regulations meaning the houses could not be sold. Mr Crest said that the resilience measures would allow much greater protection from serious worst case floods to these two houses compared with houses that had not adopted such measures. He stated that membership of the flood warning scheme would allow further protection. Mr Crest said that if the application was refused it would send a message to all householders, insurance companies and mortgage lenders that all of the houses in this area were dangerous to live in, making them virtually worthless except for non-residential commercial uses. He said that there was only a limited amount of fast food, light industrial or pubs that could be introduced into this area. Mr Crest said that those applications would then no doubt be objected to by all the neighbouring houses. He stated that he could see the benefit of raising floor levels in new build properties but to do so in existing houses made it impossible to retain the head room downstairs meaning you have to convert these properties into two bungalows with a higher ground floor level. This would require a zig zag ramp for disabled access which would take up all the space up to the pavement. He said that in that case, it would also mean sleeping would be downstairs in a flood zone, against the policies of the Environment Agency and the council. Mr Crest stated that the Environment Agency was tasked with protecting the community from flooding not using the policies for a back door managed retreat policy, which would be a disaster for the whole coastal strip from Grimsby to Boston. He said that work had already been done on the sea defences protecting this area and no flooding incidents had been reported since. Mr Crest said that a professional Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted showing how further remediation measures could turn the houses into safe properties with many years of future use instead of demolition and

reducing the value of all the houses in the area. He asked the Planning Committee to support the application.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of the Ward Councillor for the Sidney Sussex Ward, Councillor Farren.

Councillor Farren appreciated what had been presented and proposed, and she believed that the objections could be perceived as being on the back of a hard and fast planning framework policy which did not consider some of the unique local circumstances. She wrote that there was a social need for high quality and attractive family housing, for local families. Councillor Farren added that, if members were minded to approve the application, she would wholeheartedly support any condition that would forbid the use of the ground floor rooms of these properties as bedrooms, to mitigate the potential risk of flood. She wrote that further concerns had also been raised that this development could become a house of multiple occupancy, and she would not support the application if she thought that it was going to be converted into such in the short, medium or long term. Councillor Farren wrote that this was a genuine request of the Planning Committee to approve the application with conditions, to bring a disused building back into use as a family home, which was its original purpose.

Councillor Hudson said that would like to thank Councillor Farren for calling in the application. He said that the Planning Committee should use common sense. Councillor Hudson said as the speaker had said this would be the best protected homes. He stated that he was more than happy to approve the application. Councillor Hudson said that he had sat on the Planning Committee for over ten years and some applications had been approved where flood risk was the reason for them being recommended for refusal and ten years later, there had been no floods. He said that there had also been some that were refused, and they remained an eyesore in the area. Councillor Hudson said that he hoped the Planning Committee would support the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was thought the objection from the Environment Agency didn't make any sense as the building had been houses for generations. He said that it was not a new situation and essentially the buildings were being reverted to what they used to be. Councillor Parkinson said that whilst the building would be reverted to how it used to be used, there had also been improvements suggested. He stated that the alternative to approving the application was to refuse which would mean a rundown building in a high-profile area. Councillor Parkinson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that the buildings were located in a high-profile area and that they had previously been used as houses, then changed to a doctor's surgery and now it was proposed that they be used as homes again. He said that he saw no reason to refuse the application. Councillor Kaczmarek stated that if left, the buildings would go to ruin. He said that

the doctor's surgery was gone and if the conversion was not approved, it would be an eyesore in the community.

Councillor Bright said that the Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted five times and the applicant had been told what needed doing, but the assessment still did not comply. He said that this was due to a discrepancy with the floor levels and the Environment Agency had made suggestions in how to tackle the issue. Councillor Bright said that the Environment Agency had not stated that they would not support the application, but the assessment needed to be done correctly. He said that he was inclined to support the proposal of approving the application or propose that it be deferred to allow the applicant time to liaise with the Environment Agency.

Mr Dixon said that the applicant had not got the assessment right and that there were discrepancies. He said that the application had been submitted a while ago, and a decision needed to be made at some point, and that was why the application was before the Planning Committee. Mr Dixon said that the Environment Agency had outlined to the applicant what needed doing.

Councillor Lindley said that he would like to thank Councillor Farren for calling in the application as otherwise it could have been refused under delegated powers. He said that the modification that would be required to satisfy the flood risk assessment was not possible. Councillor Lindley said that he would be supporting the application.

Councillor Shutt queried whether all of the bedrooms would be upstairs.

Mr Dixon stated that they were proposed to be.

Councillor Shutt queried why it was necessary then to build one metre higher from the ground. He said that a condition could be added to mitigate against future use of the downstairs as bedrooms.

Councillor Patrick said that he did not agree with Councillor Hudson and that officers also used common sense but had to follow specific policies. He said that he was broadly supportive of the points that had been raised by other committee members. Councillor Patrick said that he viewed flood risk as a very important factor and supported the use of the sequential test. He said that the area was a densely packed area, and that the application would see the properties returned back to family homes. Councillor Patrick stated that had they had not been residential homes before, he might have been more skeptical about the application. He said that he was fully supportive of the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that she also had concerns regarding the building being used as a house of multiple occupancy. She said that the building should be used as two houses. Councillor Goodwin queried whether a condition could be added to the application that bedrooms were not on the ground floor. She said that she did have concerns about any future change of use applications with regard to houses of multiple occupancy.

Mr Dixon stated that flood risk was not just solely about loss of life, but also about damage to properties and insurance. He said that a condition could be added to the application about there being no sleeping accommodation on the ground floor as laid out in the approved plan.

Councillor Kaczmarek queried whether if the application was approved, it would be approved with conditions that there be no permitted development allowed in relation to houses of multiple occupancy and that there be no sleeping downstairs.

Councillor Pettigrew queried how the properties could be made more resilient to flooding if the application was approved.

Mr Dixon said that a condition could be added that more flood risk detail be provided. He said that the Flood Risk Assessment submitted by the applicant was not up to standard and that left an extra element of doubt.

Councillor Bright said that the Environment Agency had proposed options to the applicant and the Flood Risk Assessment was still not adequate. He said that the Planning Committee should defer the application to allow time for the Flood Risk Assessment to be completed to meet the Environment Agency requirements. Councillor Bright proposed that the application be deferred.

Mr Dixon said that was an option and that the applicant would know that the Planning Committee were minded to approve the application so there would be an incentive to make sure the Flood Risk Assessment was satisfactory. He said that it would allow the applicant another opportunity to submit an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment.

The Chair asked Mr Dixon to outline the conditions that would be included if the application was to be approved.

Mr Dixon outlined conditions that permitted development for houses of multiple occupancy would be removed, that sleeping accommodation would be defined for first floor only, that more detail be provided regarding flood risk mitigation prior to development commencing, that soundproofing details be provided, that boundary treatment, materials and hours of conversion work be conditioned.

Councillor Pettigrew seconded the proposal to defer the application to allow time for a satisfactory Flood Risk Assessment to be submitted.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 7 - DM/0597/24/OUT – 159 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the outline application and explained that it sought planning permission to erect two detached bungalows with associated external works and access with that to be considered. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council in relation to back land development. He said that the application site was located within the development boundary of Humberston and whilst the site was not allocated for housing specifically, it was located within a residential area. Mr Dixon stated that the application was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon said that back land developments had occurred in the specific area. He said that the application site could accommodate two dwellings. Mr Dixon said that no neighbour objections had been received and it was considered that the proposed development would not harm neighbouring residential amenity. The council's highways officer had raised no objection to the application but had requested a condition be added regarding the construction period. Mr Dixon said that the access had been deemed to be sufficient to serve both proposed dwellings and it had been determined that adequate parking could be achieved. Mr Dixon stated that a condition regarding Great Crested Newts had been included with the application as requested by the council's ecology officer. Mr Dixon explained that the council's trees and woodlands officer had not objected to the application, but a condition had been included with the application regarding the layout of the proposed development. He said that a sustainable drainage condition had been included with the application as recommended by the council's drainage officer. Mr Dixon said that the application was in accordance with policies 3, 5, 22, 33, 34, 38, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the application site benefitted from previous planning permissions. Mr Snowden said that the application was an outline application. He stated that the parish council had raised an objection due to it being back land development. Mr Snowden said that no neighbour objections had been received and there were no objections raised by any consultees. He said that the application site was not within a flood zone area, was within the development boundary and in low density area. Mr Snowden asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Bright said that he was not in favour of back land development, but it had occurred in Humberston for years. He said that there were no material planning considerations against the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he liked the development, it was not invasive and was consistent with Humberston Avenue. Councillor Lindley said that Humberston Village Council did object to back land development but should have raised concerns earlier about back land development in Humberston. He said that what was proposed was consistent with what

had been approved in the past. Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he had no concerns about the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Pettigrew left the meeting at this point.

Item 8 - DM/0215/23/FUL - Land at Kings Road, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for a change of use to part of an existing car park in order to create a formalised motor home parking area. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in by the Ward Councillor, Councillor Brookes. He said that the application site was located within the resort area of Cleethorpes and therefore policy 12 applied. Mr Dixon explained that policy 12 required that applications within resort areas enhance the visitor economy whilst being sensitive to both the historic and natural environment often associated with these areas within North East Lincolnshire. He said that the change of use to part of the car park to a motorhome parking area would provide additional and specific accommodation provision which would widen the current offering and therefore the application was considered acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon said that the application site was located within a flood risk area and a Sequential Test had been undertaken. He said that the application had passed the Sequential Test as it could not be located elsewhere due to the use being specifically to allow for a form of accommodation where people could access the beach and the wider resort area. Mr Dixon said that it could therefore not be located elsewhere. He said that a lot of work had taken place and fluvial and tidal flood risk has been assessed. Mr Dixon stated that the Environment Agency were satisfied that the risk was sufficiently low for fluvial flooding on this site for its lifetime. He said that the application also passed the Exceptions Test as the proposed development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community by replacing an existing informal motor home parking area within a nearby car park which had experienced issues such as littering and harm to the ecology of the area. He said that what was proposed was a managed solution which would provide the relevant facilities to prevent issues being repeated. Mr Dixon said that the Environment Agency had recommended that the site be closed during the Winter Months due to the tidal flood risk. He said that a temporary granting of permission to end the use of the site by 2074 was recommended in order to address the fluvial risk. Mr Dixon stated that the transient nature of the users of the site would also reduce the level of

risk. He said that what was recommended by the Environment Agency was considered to be sufficient to mitigate the flood risk. Mr Dixon stated that a flood warning and evacuation plan was also included with the application as a condition. Mr Dixon said that there would be minimal physical changes to the site as the proposed use was similar to the current use. He said that the proposed development would not cause visual harm to the area. Mr Dixon said that the application site was located in a predominantly commercial area and both support and objection comments were received during the consultation phase. He said that due to the separation and nature of the businesses and public park, the proposal would not have an undue impact when considering footfall and overlooking. Mr Dixon said that as there would be no permanent structures put up, the proposed development would not cause issues of massing and overshadowing. Mr Dixon explained that the site was located close to ecological designations including the Humber Estuary SSSI. He said that as the proposed development could increase the dog walking in the area, a condition had been included with the application as recommended by the council's ecology officer that information boards were put in place to note the area's sensitivity to mitigate this harm. Mr Dixon said that a condition had also been included with the application that parking could be no longer than two days with no return within one week. Mr Dixon said that this was outlined within the submitted management plan. He said that the council's highways officer had raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 12, 22, 33, 34 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Shutt said there was a statement in the supplementary agenda suggesting that a chemical toilet disposal point would be useful. He said that he hoped someone would consider that.

Mr Dixon said that the site would be managed by the Council.

Councillor Bright thought it was already agreed that there would be a chemical toilet disposal point near the public toilets.

Mr Dixon said that a management plan had been submitted as part of the application.

Councillor Shutt said that it was not specific that there would be a chemical toilet disposal point.

Mr Dixon stated that condition seven could be amended to include that one be installed.

Councillor Bright said that he was confused by the call in as there were no objections to the application. He said that tables and chairs were not allowed to be outside the motorhomes, but people being able to sit outside their motorhome was one of the main pleasures of having one. Councillor Bright queried how that could be enforced.

Mr Dixon responded that it would be up to the operator to enforce that.

Councillor Bright said that the Planning Committee could consider a two-year trial period and then review it to see how well its worked.

Mr Dixon said that the Planning Committee could do so, but that was not what the current application was proposing. He said that officers were happy with the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that she would want a condition added regarding that there be a chemical toilet disposal point.

Mr Dixon said that there were planning conditions and environmental controls as well.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that there didn't seem to be any bins in the specific area. He said that one of his concerns was that rubbish would be generated in bags and then dumped. Councillor Kaczmarek queried whether there was anything in place to deal with the rubbish.

Mr Dixon reiterated that there would be a management plan in place and the site would be Council operated. He said that there were bins in the area. Mr Dixon stated that officers were content that enough information had been provided and the application was therefore considered acceptable.

Councillor Parkinson said that he did not think any new toilets had been installed in the area.

Mr Dixon responded that the management plan referred to existing toilets and provision were being made. He said that enough information had been provided for a decision to be made regarding land use.

Councillor Parkinson said that it was not just about having toilets but also other facilities to allow for water to be topped up.

The Chair stated that the application was not for a campsite, it was for a car park.

Councillor Parkinson said that the plan was not well set out. He said that he thought it would be a good idea for the application to be deferred so clarity on some issues could be sought.

Councillor Lindley said that committee members were overthinking the application. He said that it was car park not a campsite.

Councillor Patrick said that he would be supporting the application, and the application was well overdue. He said that he appreciated there were some concerns raised regarding operation, but as it would be a council

operated site, committee members would be able to raise any issues moving forward.

Councillor Kaczmarek proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright 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 with conditions.)

P.34 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 22nd August – 19th September 2024

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.35 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.36 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.37 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 12.15pm.