



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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

30th October 2024 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright, Dawkins (substitute for Pettigrew), Emmerson, Goodwin, Hudson, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Parkinson, Patrick 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 Augusta (Park Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Shreeve (Humberston and New Waltham Ward Councillor)

There were 22 members of the public present and one member of the press.

P.38 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.39 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bright declared a pecuniary interest in P.40 Item 3 DM/0134/23/FUL as he was a member of the Humberston Fitties Tenancy Group and friends with the applicant.

Item 1 - 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 stated that the application was considered at a previous Planning Committee meeting where it was subsequently deferred by committee members in order for a site visit to take place, which had now happened. Mr Limmer explained that the application was initially brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He said that the general layout of the development would remain the same but the proposed bungalows in phases nine and ten were now proposed to be houses. 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 regarding the reserved matters. He stated that the current application did not affect that established principle. Mr Limmer said that concerns had been raised by residents regarding the impact the development would have on traffic generation, highway layout and their amenities. Mr Limmer said that due to the separation distances between the now proposed houses and the neighbouring properties, the proposed amendment would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. He said that whilst the proposed amendment would change the appearance of the development, the proposed house types were similar to those built in other phases of the development. Mr Limmer said that the overall height of phase nine would increase but would not exceed the scale of earlier phases of the development. He said that the proposed materials to be used were considered acceptable and that an updated landscaping scheme had been submitted by the applicant and was considered 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 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 envisaged that, that road would be joined up and that 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 stated 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 thanked committee members for deferring the application in order to allow for a site visit to take place. Ms Sparling said that she hoped committee members found the visit to be beneficial. She stated that the planning officer had not displayed any photos of the bends in the road during his presentation of the report. Ms Sparling said that the road was not a straight road. She said that committee members would have witnessed during the site visit, the relative tranquillity of the area due to Blackthorne Avenue only servicing the one development but soon construction traffic would use it. Ms Sparling explained that her main concern was once the development was complete, the highways would be open to all, which was a huge concern for elderly residents in the area. She said that the obvious solution would be to limit the traffic flow and separate the developments and install barriers so the traffic would be limited. Ms Sparling said that she was aware of the guidance, but an estate of this size should have two accesses. She said that the guidance provided advice and outlined how to comply with the law, but the guidance on its own was not law. Ms Sparling said that she understood officers had to follow the advice unless there were issues but, in this case, to comply with the guidance would mean more traffic using Blackthorne Avenue which could cause accidents. She said that the development should be separated, and she proposed signage to assist emergency vehicles. Ms Sparling said that a review would also be needed regarding property addresses. She stated that to her knowledge, there had been no risk assessment undertaken regarding the situation. Ms Sparling said that when the development was granted outline planning permission, there were no residents on site to comment on the road layout, but there was now. She said that residents were being impacted by decisions made over a decade ago. Ms Sparling asked committee members to reconsider the application based on evidence from a risk assessment.

Mr Lane spoke as the agent for the application. He said that planning permission had already been granted for development on the site, and that the current application sought amendments relating to house types. Mr Lane said that whilst it was proposed that the house types be changed, the layout would largely remain the same. He explained that a survey was conducted by the council's Highways Department which found that across a full day, eighteen vehicles had parked in the area from Blackthorne Avenue to Humberston Avenue, with seven vehicles parking on the road, four in the morning and three in the evening. Mr Lane said that the vehicles parking in the area were associated with school pick ups and drop offs. He stated that the vehicles in the morning were parked there for less than a minute and in the afternoon, they were parked there for slightly longer. Mr Lane said that the site layout had been designed with there being a 20mph speed limit in the site for safety purposes. He said that the junction would operate safely and efficiently. Mr Lane said that committee members would have observed there being no parking issues whilst the site visit took place and also no parked cars. He said that he would

continue to collaborate with the council and the residents of Carrington Gardens. Mr Lane said that at the previous Planning Committee meeting he had explained why the development could not be divided in half. He said that he fully endorsed the planning officers report.

Councillor Hudson said that he had supported the idea of a site visit being organised due to residents raising concerns about the road and safety. Councillor Hudson said that the development had planning permission, and the current application was simply regarding house types. He said that one of his observations during the site visit was that the bends in the road made it impossible for drivers to speed, which he thought would help. Councillor Hudson said that it appeared that the road was designed to stop there being speeding. He stated that once the roads were adopted, then highways officers would be able to look at options, but the Planning Committee were not able to change the road layout, they were simply considering the house types as outlined in the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he had been at the site visit and thought the homes were lovely. He said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson in that when the roads were adopted, the situation could be looked at by the Highways Department. Councillor Shutt said that the application was regarding house types, not highways and therefore the Planning Committee could only consider what the application was seeking planning permission for.

Councillor Bright said that he had sympathy for the residents, but the road was a part of the approved plans, and the Planning Committee were there to consider the proposed house types. He stated that material planning reasons would be needed to refuse the application, and he couldn't see any. Councillor Bright said that he agreed that the Highways Department could look at the roads once adopted.

Councillor Dawkins said that he agreed with the residents regarding the road, but the application related to house types and that's what the committee were there to discuss. He said that he would request that the developer be considerate to residents, and he hoped measures were put in place so it would not be dangerous. Councillor Dawkins said that he was sure that once the roads were adopted, the area would be looked at by the authority.

Councillor Lindley said that he had been on the site visit and thought the development was very nice. He agreed with what other committee members had said. Councillor Lindley said that the natural bends in the road, were good speeding measures. He stated that he was struggling to see a reason to object to the application. Councillor Lindley said that he was minded to support the application but would listen to rest of the debate.

Councillor Kaczmarek queried how many of the proposed bungalows were now proposed to be houses and how many additional bedrooms would there be.

Mr Limmer responded that he could not provide those figures.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was very impressed with the design of the development and thought that a lot of care had gone into the buildings. He said that there was a nice variety of properties. Councillor Parkinson said that he was happy with the proposed change of there being houses instead of bungalows. He stated that the road had planning permission, but residents should speak with the Highways Department if they had concerns in the future.

Councillor Lindley said that the development provided a good variety of properties and would meet the needs of different people. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions

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

Item 2 - DM/0761/23/FUL - Land Off Louth Road, New Waltham

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission to erect 249 dwellings with associated garages, open spaces, landscaping, drainage, emergency access and associated infrastructure with a new access. Mr Limmer explained that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received as well as an objection from New Waltham Parish Council and other parish councils. He said that the proposed site was allocated for housing in the local plan and was located within the development boundary for New Waltham. Mr Limmer stated that the development was acceptable in principle. He said that there were acceptable separation distances between the proposed dwellings and existing neighbouring properties. Mr Limmer said that the proposed layout had been designed to create an outward looking development with landscaping along the edge to soften the visual impact and open spaces which would provide good amenity to residents. He said that there would be a mixture of different dwellings, both in design and in the materials proposed to be used. Mr Limmer stated that the design of the proposed development was considered to be acceptable and would not cause adverse harm to the character of the area. He said that the applicant had provided a detailed Drainage Strategy which was considered acceptable by the council's drainage officer. Mr Limmer said that the council's drainage officer had asked that a condition be included with the application that final detail be provided regarding surface water drainage. He said that the applicant had also submitted a Transport Assessment and Air Quality Assessment. Mr Limmer stated that the Transport Assessment had been considered by the council's highways officer with

further considerations and assessments requested and subsequently provided. He said that the Air Quality Assessment that had been provided was also considered acceptable by the council's environmental health officer. Mr Limmer said that the application included a new signalised access onto the A16 Louth Road, which would tie into the access currently under construction to serve the development on the other side of Louth Road. He said that the proposed new access had been designed closely with the Highways Department to ensure it would work and be acceptable. Mr Limmer explained that in recent years improvements had been made to the Toll Bar junction by the council and these works were designed to improve flows and the capacity of the junction. Mr Limmer said that these works were also designed to accommodate future growth, and this included the application site as an allocation for additional housing. He said that whilst the proposed development would mean additional traffic using the junction, it would not lead to an unacceptable or severe impact on the junction and no further improvement works were required. Mr Limmer said that as 249 dwellings were proposed, a main secondary access was not required. He said that an emergency access was required for developments between 150 – 250 dwellings and this was detailed in the site plans and had been included as a condition with the application. Mr Limmer stated that the council's highways officer has considered the proposed development in detail and concluded that it would not cause a severe impact on the highway network with regard to amenity and would not be unacceptable with regard to highway safety. He said that the council's highways officer had recommended that conditions be added to the application. Mr Limmer said that the application was submitted prior to the legislation regarding Biodiversity Net Gain being enacted and was therefore exempt from that policy. He said that the applicant had provided a Habitat Regulations Assessment, which had been reviewed by Natural England and the council's ecology officer and no objections had been raised. Mr Limmer said that conditions recommended by the council's ecology officer had been included with the application. He said that a Section 106 agreement had been agreed with the applicant but had not yet been signed. Mr Limmer explained that the Section 106 agreement would secure a 20% affordable housing provision and a contribution to education. He explained that an additional condition had been added to the application regarding swift boxes, and the wording of conditions 6, 8, 9 and 16 had been tweaked. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 22, 33, 34, 41, 42 and 43 of the North East Lincolnshire Plan and the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework. He said that the application was therefore recommended for approval with conditions and subject to the section 106 agreement being signed.

Mrs Johnson spoke in objection to the application. She said that the net completion rate for dwellings being built was above the minimum figures outlined in the five-year demand survey. Mrs Johnson said that the first plan showed an attenuation pond and that the proposed dwellings would be orientated away, but the revised plan did not tally with that statement. She said that Holton Le Clay had its own village plan which was different

to the local plan. Mrs Johnson said that the A16 was one of the busiest roads in North East Lincolnshire and the proposed development could mean 1000 more vehicles using that stretch of road. She said that after having witnessed the chaos caused by temporary lights, permanent lights would do the same. Mrs Johnson said that there were also issues with the Toll Bar roundabout. She said that the local plan stated that transport infrastructure should contribute to environmental excellence. Mrs Johnson queried whether the council was taking into account that tyre debris was more dangerous than carbon emissions and the area of Tollbar Roundabout already well exceeded the pollution levels. She asked whether the council would take responsibility for health of children in the area and other residents. Mrs Johnson said that there was also protected species living on the field. She said that there was a lack of infrastructure for the development. Mrs Johnson asked committee members to refuse the application.

Mr Ibbotson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the application site was an allocated site for housing. Mr Ibbotson said that he had worked with the Highways Department regarding the junction, and it had been determined that the development would not lead to a severe impact on the road network. He said that there would be a separate access if required and that the road could accommodate emergency vehicles. Mr Ibbotson stated that the drainage at the proposed development was considered to be acceptable. He said that that the proposed development would lead to an increase in biodiversity at the site. Mr Ibbotson said that swift boxes would be attached to the buildings and there would be gaps in the fencing to allow for hedgehogs. He said that the proposed ecology enhancements were supported by officers. Mr Ibbotson said that there had been local objections to the application, and he had tried to address those. He said that the houses on Maple Grove would have a green wedge meaning there would be further separation. Mr Ibbotson said that committee members should consider the success of the company's other developments such as Becklands. He said that the company was local developers who had a proven record of providing good quality houses. Mr Ibbotson said that there were no issues with traffic generation, highways safety, ecology or landscaping. He said that it was a well-designed scheme which would support the housing supply and offer affordable housing. Mr Ibbotson asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Shreeve spoke as the Ward Councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He said that when you consider the application, the development did seem to have a lot to recommend it, as it would offer affordable housing, the site was located within the local plan and planning officers were happy it. Councillor Shreeve said that whilst that was all true, the development was still in the wrong place. He said that he was astonished at the number of objections received against the application. Councillor Shreeve said that New Waltham Parish Council and Holton Le Clay Parish Council had also objected to the application as well as two other developers. He said that when you read through all of the objections, you don't see the same words and issues. Councillor

Shreeve said that you see similar issues raised that are genuine concerns. He stated that virtually every home had objected to the development. Councillor Shreeve said that you can group together most of the issues to three points, which were over intensification, traffic issues and the erosion of green spaces. He stated that he had so much sympathy for residents. Councillor Shreeve said that with traffic lights at the entry to the proposed new development it could lead to the residents of Maple Grove and Hawthorne Avenue being landlocked at certain times of the day. He said that drivers would not be able to turn right out onto Louth Road, they would have to turn left, and whilst you might be able to turn right at the traffic lights and circle back, you couldn't have sixty vehicles doing that every day. Councillor Shreeve said resident's views should be taken into account. He asked committee members to refuse the application.

Councillor Dawkins had concerns regarding the highways. Councillor Dawkins said that the Highways Department had no issues with the proposed development, but there were major issues at the moment in relation to the current two-way lights. He said that each property proposed could have two cars which would mean 500 vehicles using the access. Councillor Dawkins said that currently on the evening, the roads were backed up all the way to Peaks Parkway. He stated that the four-way junction had made the situation worse, and it was horrendous now. Councillor Dawkins said that he disagreed with the agent who had spoken about the success of the Becklands development, as he thought there were major issues in relation to access and egress at that site. He stated that the junction at Becklands was dangerous. Councillor Dawkins said that he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Hudson said that the site was an allocated site for housing and when he had looked at the plans, he thought the proposed development had been designed very well and was not a bad scheme, but then you consider the issue of highways. He said that the Planning Committee's decision regarding the opposite site had been overturned by the Planning Inspector and he could see the inspector doing the exact same thing if this application was refused. Councillor Hudson stated that good reasons were needed to refuse the application. He said that it was important that the Planning Committee took seriously all of the objections that had been submitted. Councillor Hudson said that the road was horrendous and as the objector had outlined, the development would impact the pollution levels. He said that were the Planning Committee to refuse the application, there was the risk that the Planning Inspector would overturn that decision, but he thought it was really important to listen to residents. Councillor Hudson said that the problem he had with the proposed development were the highways issues.

Councillor Bright said that lots of objections had been submitted against the application. He said that there was nothing in the local plan about services and no assessment had been done on the impact of that. Councillor Bright said that the council's highways officers had determined that the application met all the requirements in terms of highways, but

there was the potential of 500 more vehicles using the roads which would impact the pollution limit. He said it had also been determined that the developer could get away with a single access, but that did nothing for the residents. Councillor Bright said when you look at Scartho, it was gridlocked. He stated that the proposed development looked fine, but he had concerns relating to traffic and pollution. Councillor Bright said that he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Lindley said that the proposed development was in the wrong place, and it would impact the strategic gap. He said that just because the site was allocated in the local plan, it did not mean committee members should just agree to it. Councillor Lindey said that the specific highway was very busy, and he agreed with Councillor Bright about other developments contributing to Scartho being gridlocked at peak times. He said that he had concerns about similar issues happening here. Councillor Lindley said that the site was allocated in the local plan, and it was correct to say that if it was to be refused by the Planning Committee, it could go to appeal, but the highways issues had not been thought out. He said that there were issues with the access and egress of the junction and that there were current issues on Louth Road with the traffic lights, with people having to leave half an hour earlier due to those traffic lights. Councillor Lindley stated that the issue of highways had not been thought out, and the proposed development would contribute to an already busy highway network and would contribute to the issues in Scartho and at Peaks Parkway. Councillor Lindley said that we could not keep feeding traffic onto already busy roads. He said that the proposed development could mean an additional 500 vehicles using the roads and that would seriously impact on the traffic flow, and he thought it was a bridge too far. Councillor Lindley said that the proposed development would be in the wrong place, and he had huge concerns. He stated that he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Shutt queried whether there would be a planning application in future for the land next to the site.

Mr Limmer confirmed that land was also allocated in the local plan for housing but was not part of the current application.

Councillor Shutt queried whether the Planning Committee could put a condition onto the current application, that the adjacent land was not developed on.

Mr Dixon said that the Planning Committee could not do that, and that land was allocated for housing in the local plan. He said that the issue of air quality had been mentioned, but an Air Quality Assessment had been undertaken and was considered acceptable. Mr Dixon reminded the Planning Committee that the site was allocated for housing in the adopted Local Plan in response to comments made as to whether it was the right site for housing. Mr Dixon said that a proposed development's impact on the highway network had to be considered to be severe in order for the Highways Department to object to an application. Mr Dixon

said that a previous application for a site nearby had been refused by the Planning Committee due to highways concerns but was then allowed at appeal. He stated that, as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, the impact had to be severe to the highway network and it was not shown that that would be the case with this application. Mr Dixon said that the land next to the site for the proposed development was allocated for housing, and a second access would be needed if it was to be developed on, but a condition prohibiting development on that site could not be added to the current application if it were approved.

Councillor Shutt said that as an example 300 houses could be built if the land was put together and he didn't think it benefitted residents for developments to be granted planning permission and built in chunks instead. He said that we had to make a decision of whether we were going to expand or not, but he thought it was important to consider infrastructure first. Councillor Shutt said that he had concerns that the area would turn into another Scartho in terms of issues with highways, but he also understood that we had to build new houses. He stated that he was conflicted as he understood resident's frustrations, and he thought the developer had perhaps not been as honest as they should have been regarding the rest of the land.

Councillor Kaczmarek queried whether the footpath would have lighting as a means of public safety.

Mr Limmer responded that the footpath would be retained as a rural footpath and would not be fully lit.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he thought overall, it was a great site and the design was brilliant with green spaces included. He said that he was unsure what the reason would be for the Planning Committee to refuse the application. Councillor Kaczmarek said that he thought to simply say that the proposed development would cause more traffic, could lead to the decision being overturned at appeal. He stated that he appreciated that the proposed development would cause congestion on the existing road network and that needed to be looked at, but that was not what the Planning Committee was there to do. Councillor Kaczmarek said that the Planning Committee's job was to consider the application, and he could not see any reason to support a proposal to refuse the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Goodwin said that the situation reminded her of the application for Torbay Drive. She said that she thought it was a good application, and the site was allocated for housing in the local plan subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement. Councillor Goodwin queried that the Section 106 agreement would go ahead if the application were approved.

Mr Dixon said that it would, if the application were approved.

Councillor Goodwin queried whether the application would come back before the Planning Committee for re-consideration if the Section 106 agreement was not signed.

Mr Dixon responded that it would as the application wouldn't be compliant.

Councillor Goodwin said that she was conflicted as if the Planning Committee were to refuse the application, it could go to appeal as the Torbay Drive application had, and it could end up costing the authority money. She stated that she was concerned about the cost to the council and the site was allocated in the local plan. Councillor Goodwin seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that he could see where it was going to go with the other land, and it would make the junction in the area worse. He said that he could not understand why every junction had to be controlled by traffic lights. Councillor Dawkins stated that he could not support the application.

Councillor Lindley said that the Planning Committee should not be frightened by the prospect of an application going to appeal or by previous decisions that the Planning Inspector had made. He stated that decisions should be based on the merit of the application, and the infrastructure at present was not fit for purpose for the development. Councillor Lindley said that no new roads were proposed to be put in, and Peaks Parkway was supposed to alleviate the problems when it was first put in, but it had now outgrown itself. He said that both Peaks Parkway and Scartho Road were congested at peak times and there was not the infrastructure, and something had to give. Councillor Lindley reiterated that he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Bright said that he understood that the Highways Department had to follow the guidance, but the reality of the situation was somewhat different.

Ms Hattle-Fitzgerald responded to a query from Councillor Bright with regard to Scartho Top and explained that Scartho Top had always been intended to have two points of access but that it was not appropriate to discuss Scartho when looking at another development.

Councillor Parkinson said that a tremendous number of objections to the application had been submitted. He said that the site was allowed to go in the local plan and people should have objected at that time. Councillor Parkinson said that Councillor Shreeve had put forward a very good case, but the site was allocated for housing, which made the situation difficult. He asked if the Highway Authority were involved in the site allocation process and whether junctions were considered.

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald said that they were involved. She said the Highways Department were comfortable with the application.

Councillor Parkinson queried whether the Planning Committee could defer the application and ask that a second exit be included now.

Mr Dixon said that was a up to the Planning Committee to decide if that's what they wanted to do, but there was no justification for a second access.

Councillor Parkinson said that to build 249 properties now and then to develop more later didn't seem to be a responsible thing to do.

Mr Dixon said that that situation was not unusual.

Councillor Parkinson said that it looked blatant with stopping at 249 limit as a second access would be needed if the rest was built out.

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald said that if the other land was built out, a second access would be needed.

Councillor Emmerson said that he was astonished and impressed by all of the objections that had been received. He said that the local MP had also objected to the application. Councillor Emmerson said that there were no public services proposed to go with the development. He said that what was proposed was a single road, similar to Scartho Top which would become very busy. Councillor Emmerson stated that the Tollbar School traffic would be just up the road. He said the proposed development would also impact the strategic gap. Councillor Emmerson that he would support a proposal of refusing the application.

Councillor Hudson said that what the debate about the application showed, was that the public were not engaging with the local plan process. He said that had there been objections prior to the land being allocated in the local plan, it could have been considered at that point. Councillor Hudson said that was a lesson for the future.

Councillor Patrick said that there had been a failure with the local plan and with national planning. He said that whilst he appreciated Councillor Hudson's point about considering the land at the time the local plan was considered, had there been objections to its inclusion, you would then have had to put forward a different site and he wasn't sure what that would have been. Councillor Patrick stated that he thought an appeal to a decision from the Planning Committee to refuse the application would be successful. He said that it was not about committee members being scared, but about tax payers having to pay the costs of a successful appeal. Councillor Patrick said that he also did not want to give false hope to those objecting. He said that he had sympathy for residents and that the proposed development would cause traffic problems.

Councillor Shutt said that he thought that traffic lights at junctions were the best option.

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald said that traffic lights were the most practical option.

The committee took a vote to approve the application with conditions and upon a vote, 5 voted for and 6 voted against the proposal.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Mr Dixon queried whether the reasons for refusing the application were due to adverse level of traffic, detrimental congestion and impact on highway amenity.

Councillor Lindley and Councillor Dawkins agreed that they were the reasons.

Councillor Bright asked that impact to pollution also be listed as a reason.

Mr Dixon said that an Air Quality Assessment had been undertaken which was considered acceptable by officers.

Councillor Lindley and Councillor Dawkins agreed that the additional reason for refusing the application be added.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Councillor Bright left the meeting at this point.

Item 3 – DM/0134/23/FUL – 121 Humberston Fitties, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought retrospective planning permission to replace fencing and for the installation of new gravel drives to the front. Mr Dixon explained that the application was initially recommended for approval with conditions and brought before the Planning Committee at a previous meeting due to the number of objections received and an objection from Humberston Village Council. He said that at that meeting, committee members deferred the application as the applicant had stated that they wanted to make changes to the application and retain the extent of the gravel and keep the fencing they had. Mr Dixon said that the existing chalet was located within an existing holiday park and was within the defined resort area. He said that the development was acceptable in principle as long as there were no detrimental impacts as a result. Mr Dixon said that the existing chalet was located with the Humberston Fitties Conservation Area and therefore consideration had to be given as to whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of that

conservation area. Mr Dixon said that with the applicant deciding to make changes to the application and revert back to keeping the extent of the gravel and the close boarded fencing, re-consultation had to take place. He said that the council's heritage officer and the Humberston Village Council subsequently reiterated their initial concerns. Mr Dixon said that with those concerns taken into account it was considered that the amount of gravel at the site dominated the plot and the close boarded fencing was in contrary to the Humberston Fitties Design Guide and did not respond to the character of the Humberston Fitties Conservation Area and would therefore result in visual harm. Mr Dixon stated that the development would not be detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring holiday chalets in terms of massing and overlooking. He 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.

Mr Moore spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that the application had previously been considered by the Planning Committee eight weeks ago. Mr Moore said that he had lived at the Humberston Fitties for twelve years and lived in Humberston for fifteen years. He said that the original fence had blown over and he therefore had to put new fences up. Mr Moore stated that the original fencing had not been picket fencing. He said that at that same time, he had put new driveways in. Mr Moore explained that he had been having discussions with planning officers for three years about this application and had tried to work with everybody. He said that the reason for the driveways was to get cars off the road. Mr Moore stated that he did not believe he had done anything wrong. He reiterated that the original fencing was not picket fencing. Mr Moore said that due to the two-month closure of the Humberston Fitties, he felt more secure with having close boarded fences.

Councillor Hudson said that he was really pleased to see the application come before the Planning Committee again. He said that it was a high-quality development, and the fence had been replaced with what was there originally. Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson and that the development was very nice. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he could sense the applicant's frustration. He said that the development looked fantastic. Councillor Shutt said that he disagreed with some of the points regarding conservation but that was his personal view. He stated that he would support the proposal of approving the application.

Mr Dixon outlined conditions for if the application was to be approved.

Councillor Hudson and Councillor Dawkins agreed with the conditions being added.

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/0422/24/FUL – 73 Welholme Avenue, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the removal of a chimney on the north elevation. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received and a call in from the Ward Councillor, Councillor Augusta. He explained that originally the application had sought permission to change the use of the existing first and second floor flat from a C3 dwelling to a C4 house in multiple occupation with landlord storage on the second floor and the obscuring of four windows. Mr Dixon said that following negotiations, the change of use element of the application had been removed and the application now solely related to the removal of the chimney. He said that the application site was located within the development boundary of Grimsby and the development was acceptable in principle as long as there were no detrimental impacts as a result. Mr Dixon said that the application site was also located within the Wellow Conservation Area and therefore consideration had to be given as to whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of that conservation area. Mr Dixon said that whilst there was a preference to original property features being retained, the loss of the chimney was considered to have a neutral impact on the conservation area given its location to the side of the property and its size. He stated that the chimney was also unsafe. Mr Dixon said that the council's heritage officer had requested that the chimney be repaired, however, on balance the loss of the chimney was considered acceptable. He said that the council's ecology officer had recommended that an informative be included with the application in order to ensure that no bats or birds are disturbed as a result of the works. Mr Dixon said that there would be no detrimental harm caused to neighbouring amenity as a result of the works. He stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 39 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Augusta spoke as the Ward Councillor for the Park Ward. He explained that he had originally called in the application as it was proposed that the building be changed to a house of multiple occupancy. Councillor Augusta said that even though the change of use element of the application had been removed, he still believed the application should be refused based on heritage concerns. He said that the council's heritage officer had stated that the removal of the chimney would be in contrary to section 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. Councillor Augusta

stated that it was important to protect heritage and the skyline. He asked committee members to refuse the application.

Councillor Dawkins proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Parkinson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright said that the council's heritage officer was an expert in the field, and she had described the proposal as egregious. He said that he couldn't understand why the committee were considering overruling the council's heritage officer. Councillor Bright said that it was ridiculous to not listen to the officer.

Mr Dixon said that the Planning Committee had to consider the application on balance. He reiterated that the council's heritage officer had objected, but they had to consider other issues raised.

Councillor Hudson said that the heritage officer had given the Planning Committee advice. He queried who was going to miss the chimney. Councillor Hudson said that old houses have lots of chimneys and the chimney could be blown over. He stated that he thought it best to have it taken down.

Councillor Patrick said that whilst it was a small application being considered, committee members should not be so quick to approve. He thanked Councillor Augusta for bringing the application to the attention of the Planning Committee.

Councillor Goodwin said that whilst it might just be a chimney, that doesn't necessarily mean it should just come down. She said that there was a discussion at a previous committee meeting about a street that had a lot of changes made to it, that went against conservation and the argument was that things had already changed, so there wasn't a reason to stop any future changes. Councillor Goodwin stated that there was the opportunity in this case to stop changes happening before they started.

Councillor Lindley referred to the officer's report which stated that the chimney had lost value and was unsafe. He said that he would support the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Shutt said that the Planning Committee did listen to the advice from officers. He said, however, that committee members had supported the previous application despite the objection from the council's heritage officer as the applicant had done a good job. Councillor Shutt said that he thought the Planning Committee needed to take the safer decision. He stated that he would be supporting the proposal of approving the application.

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 5 – DM/0268/24/FUL – 45 Sea View Street, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for a change of use from a shop to an Air BnB. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from the Ward Councillor, Councillor Freeston. He said that the existing premises were located within the development boundary of Cleethorpes and in the Town Centre. Mr Dixon said that Policy 23 of the local plan outlined that development should only be supported where it “contributes to the vitality and vibrancy of the Town Centre”. He said that it was accepted that Air BnB’s can contribute positively to Town Centre’s by bringing increased footfall into the area. Mr Dixon stated that Sea View Street used to be predominantly retail shops, but that had changed in recent years and there was now various restaurants and bars within the street. He said that the applicant had also stated that the property had been on the market for a while and was vacant with there being no interested buyers. Mr Dixon said that due to the changes within Sea View Street it was not considered that the change of use from a retail shop to an Air BnB would undermine the viability and vitality of the area and was therefore acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon explained that the premises were also located within the Cleethorpes Central Seafront Conservation Area and it was therefore important to consider whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of that conservation area. He said that the only external works proposed were that the external shutter be removed. Mr Dixon said that the council’s heritage officer had raised no objections to the application. He stated that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. Mr Dixon said that the Environmental Protection Team had also assessed the application in terms of the effects on future occupiers. He said that a Noise Impact Assessment had been submitted and reviewed and officers were content with the recommendations. Mr Dixon explained that the mitigation of double-glazed windows, could be secured by a condition and the applicant had confirmed that the existing window frames would be retained. He said that it was also considered that the use of the premises as an Air BnB instead of a residential dwelling would help to mitigate potential impact to the occupiers as they would be more transient and would have a choice as to the acceptability of the location. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 23 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms McCartney spoke as the applicant for the application. She said that she was the property owner and wanted to convert the premise and run it as an Air BnB, changing the use from its current use as a retail premise. Ms McCartney said that she had originally put the premise up for sale as a shop without success. She noted that noise concerns had been dealt

with. Ms McCartney said that the application was now recommended for approval by planning officers, and she had received four letters of support from those with properties on Sea View Street. She stated that the Air BnB would enhance the area and would not have a negative impact. Ms McCartney said that she believed the proposed development would benefit Cleethorpes and provide a betterment to the area by bringing a vacant building back into use. She explained that the external shutters would be removed, and she would fully adhere to the conditions and carry out all necessary actions to follow planning policies. Ms McCartney asked committee members to support her application.

Councillor Dawkins said that it was a shame to lose a shop down Sea View Street. He said that he did not think the Planning Committee should allow the change of use to an Air BnB. Councillor Dawkins stated that the more shops down Sea View Street, the better. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Parkinson said that he felt that Sea View Street should remain as an area for shops. He said that it was not all that long ago, that the street was a runner up in a competition for being the best high street in the country. Councillor Parkinson stated that shops do tend to let and that maintaining shops was important. He said that whilst he understood noise had been considered for future occupiers, there was bars down the street where people congregate. Councillor Parkinson said that he thought this was the wrong place and wrong idea.

Councillor Hudson said that he disagreed with what other committee members had said. He said that he thought people would be delighted that the premise was not proposed to be another bar. Councillor Hudson stated that he didn't want to see an empty shop and thought that Sea View Street was a good location for people to stay. He said that he thought the scheme was brilliant and if you were on holiday, you would probably want to visit the nearby bars, so might not be as concerned with noise.

Councillor Lindley said that he disagreed with Councillor Hudson. He said that the street was a jewel in the area and whilst there had been some changes, the street still had the character of what people would expect of Sea View Street. Councillor Lindley said that the area had always been a mixture of commercial premises, but not residential. He said that he did not think the use of the premises as residential would enhance the area. Councillor Lindley said that Sea View Street was still popular, and the character of the area needed to be maintained. He said that he thought somebody would come along and take the shop on as it was a very desirable area for retail.

Councillor Goodwin said that she agreed with Councillor Hudson. She said that it could end up being that the shop be on the market, and no one decide to take it on. Councillor Goodwin said that Sea View Street had gone down hill and she thought people would be happy that the

shop was not proposed to be changed to a bar. She proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that he saw no issues with the application and that all of the key consultees were happy with the application. He said that what was proposed would mean the street would be mixed use and it was not that the whole street would be turning residential. Councillor Bright said that he hoped that those staying at the Air BnB would spend money in the nearby shops.

Councillor Shutt said that the lady had tried to sell the premises as a shop but had not been able to. He said that he was leaning towards supporting the proposal of approving the application. Councillor Shutt said that the council had to try different things. He said that it was good that the premises were not located within a flood zone.

Councillor Patrick said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson about the premises not being proposed to be another bar as they can be more detrimental. He said that the Air BnB would contribute to the local economy, and he would be voting in support of the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that he was torn on this application as there was pros and cons to it. He said that it would provide a different offering than to what was on Sea View Street at present but it was a strange location. Councillor Emmerson said that the applicant had put a good business case forward and he was sure she would have done her own research.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he fully supported the application. He said that there were shops in the area that had closed for varying reasons. Councillor Kaczmarek said that things had changed, and you don't tend to have booming high streets anymore as lots of people tended to shop online more. He said that he hoped that those staying at the Air BnB would visit the nearby shops. Councillor Kaczmarek stated that he saw no reason to not approve the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that the application wouldn't have come before the Planning Committee without the call in. She said that she would like to hear the reasons for the call in.

Councillor Parkinson said that he thought it was important to keep Sea View Street as a shopping street.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 8 for and 3 against for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 6 - DM/0386/24/FUL – 25 Chantry Lane, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for a change of use with alterations from a commercial premises to a ten-person house of multiple occupancy. He said that the application also sought planning permission for the erection of a single storey side extension, the creation of a cycle store and other associated works. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He said that the application was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon said that the existing premises were located within a mixed used area and the change of use and proposed works would not be at odds with the area. He said that the creation of a bay window within the front elevation would enhance the street scene and was considered to be a betterment to the area. Mr Dixon said that the proposed change of use would be unlikely to cause an increase in the comings and goings than the premises current commercial use. He said that the proposed external alterations proposed would not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of massing, dominance, overshadowing or overlooking given their position, design and scale. Mr Dixon stated that the council's Environmental Health Officer had requested a condition be added regarding hours of construction which would assist in mitigating against any adverse impacts to neighbouring amenity during that period. Mr Dixon said that the council's Housing Officer had raised no objections to the application and had found the room sizes and amenities to be adequate. He explained that the council's Housing Officer had requested a condition be added regarding waste management strategy. Mr Dixon said that the premises were located within a highly sustainable area. He said that the council's Highways Officer had requested a condition be added regarding the security of the cycle parking facilities. Mr Dixon stated that the council's Highways Officer considered the car parking arrangements acceptable and that the change of use would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the impact to the capacity of the public road network would not be severe. He said that there were no issues with the application in relation to flooding or drainage. Mr Dixon stated that the council's ecology officer had raised no objections to the application. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 36, 39 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 it was a vacant commercial building that had been vacant for a long time prior to its previous use. Mr Deakins stated that there wasn't a high demand for these buildings as commercial buildings. He said that the majority of the street was residential. Mr Deakins said that he understood houses of multiple occupancy were hot topics at present but if you include this property, there were only seven buildings in the street that were either flats or houses of multiple occupancy, with the rest being residential. He stated that there was not the demand for cars as people would think. Mr Deakins said that more traditional windows that fit with windows on nearby properties would be put in. He stated that if the application were approved,

it would bring back into use a vacant building and improve the appearance of the street. Mr Deakins asked committee members to support the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he generally tended to oppose houses of multiple occupancy but what the application proposed was that an empty space, be brought back into use. He said that he would rather see a building be renovated and used, then not. Councillor Kaczmarek stated that he agreed with officers. He said that he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with Councillor Kaczmarek in that he tended to also oppose houses of multiple occupancy and that there was currently a Cabinet Working Group looking into houses of multiple occupancy. He said that there were no material objections to the application from any consultees. Councillor Bright said that for this specific case, he thought the application should be approved. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt said that what was proposed would be a licensed house of multiple occupancy with a commercial waste plan, and it was not just going to rely on green bins. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he agreed with the other committee members regarding concerns about houses of multiple occupancy, but in this case, he would support the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 9 for and 2 against for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 7 - DM/0193/24/FUL – 2-4 (Part Of) Edward Street, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for a change of use from a retail unit to a residential dwelling with retrospective works including the removal and replacement of the existing shop front and removal of the existing first floor bay window on the front elevation to replace with a standard window. Mr Dixon stated that the application also included alterations to window and door openings 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 premises were located within the development boundary of Grimsby and within flood zone three. He said that the applicant had submitted an initial Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency had raised concerns. Mr Dixon said that the Flood Risk Assessment was subsequently updated, and the Environment Agency retracted their objections to the application. He said however that the floor levels had now been reassessed and it now meant that the previous mitigation recommended could not be achieved. Mr Dixon stated

that the applicant had proposed a flood gate, but the Environment Agency had deemed that to not be acceptable flood risk mitigation. Mr Dixon said that the Environment Agency had reviewed the application and the most updated Flood Risk Assessment and had raised an objection. He said that the application was therefore not acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon stated that a Flood Warning Evacuation Plan had been submitted as part of the application and reviewed but further information had been requested which could be secured as a condition should the application be approved. He said that the issue of principle remained due to the flood risk. Mr Dixon said that some of the external works had been completed, but not all. He said that the council's heritage officer had raised concerns about the loss of traditional features, but as the premises were neither located within a conservation area or a designated heritage asset, and the application presented an opportunity for the premises to be reused, it was considered that there were no grounds to weigh against the application from a heritage perspective. Mr Dixon said that the change of use and the alterations would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area. He said that the change of use to a residential dwelling would not cause any adverse impacts to the neighbouring properties, due to the largely residential nature of the area. Mr Dixon stated that the alterations would not result in an adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity. He said that there were also no concerns raised regarding future occupiers' amenity. Mr Dixon said that in the absence of acceptable flooding mitigation, the application was not in accordance with policy 5 and 33 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent for the application. He said that since the business closed, the premises were listed and sold in 2023. Mr Snowden said that his clients then bought the premises. He said that the change of use would have no visual impact as the area was predominantly residential and the external changes were minor. Mr Snowden stated that the council's highways and drainage officers supported the application. He said that the recommendation to refuse the application was due to the flood risk. Mr Snowden explained that due to the building's ceiling height, the floor levels could not be raised by a metre. He said that a wall had been proposed and a Flood Warning Evacuation Plan had been submitted. Mr Snowden stated that the application was supported by the Ward Councillor. He asked whether we wanted to see a vacant building in the area and if we wanted to prevent regeneration. Mr Snowden asked committee members to approve the application.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement from the Ward Councillor for the Heneage Ward, Councillor Clough.

Councillor Clough wrote that she believed consideration had been given to omit the flood risk and the property would be in line with other properties that surround it. She wrote that the area was near town, located close to a school and affordable housing was needed in the area. Councillor Clough wrote in her statement that if members were minded to endorse the application, she would wholeheartedly support any condition that

would forbid the use of the ground floor rooms of the property being used as bedrooms, to mitigate the potential risk of flood. She wrote that her support would also not extend to the possibility of the building becoming a house of multiple occupancy either now or in the future. Councillor Clough wrote in her statement that having met with the owner and the agent they were in full agreement with that and had made efforts to transform the property into a home with bedrooms upstairs. They were also happy to have a wall that was in keeping with neighbouring properties that would add to flood protection. She 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. She wrote that the area was highly populated with families, and this was a walk past for many on the school run. Councillor Clough wrote in her statement that aesthetically the area would benefit from works being completed.

Councillor Dawkins said that the property used to be a residential home, was then used as a business and was now proposed to go back to being used as a home. He said that he thought it was ridiculous to ask that the floor levels be raised by a metre as he had never seen a flood in that area. Councillor Dawkins proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that the application was similar to an application considered at the last meeting of the Planning Committee. He said that committee members shouldn't ignore flood risk and that the Environment Agency were not against the application, but they did want a detailed explanation and mitigation to be agreed. Councillor Bright said that he was minded to support the proposal of approving the application, but thought the issue of flood risk shouldn't be ignored.

Councillor Hudson said that the bedrooms would be upstairs. He stated that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Shutt said that it was agreed that the bedrooms be upstairs. He said that he would support the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that the property was not located within a conservation area, there were no objections from the Highways Department or from neighbours. He said that the Planning Committee should approve the application as they had done with a similar application considered at the last meeting. Councillor Emmerson said that what was proposed would make good use of a building that was currently disused.

Councillor Goodwin said that she agreed with what other committee members had said. She said that the applicant had also proposed putting a wall in, as a form of mitigation. Councillor Goodwin said that as a similar previous application was approved for Grimsby Road, then the current application should also be approved with the wall put in and the bedrooms being upstairs.

Councillor Patrick said that he was supportive of the application, but would want a condition adding to the application, that there be no downstairs

bedrooms and a condition that a flood evacuation plan be submitted and approved.

Councillor Parkinson sought clarification regarding the wall that was proposed as flood mitigation.

Mr Dixon stated that the Environment Agency had determined that the wall would not work, and therefore it was not something that would be suggested to add as a condition. He said that if the applicant wished to put the wall in anyway, that was their decision.

Councillor Parkinson said that the application was different to the previous application for Grimsby Road. He queried whether a condition would be added regarding having plug sockets higher.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Dixon outlined suggested conditions.

Councillor Dawkins and Councillor Hudson agreed with the conditions being added.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 8 - DM/0085/24/FUL - 151 Scartho Road, Grimsby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the partial demolition of an existing bungalow and the erection of two storey extensions to the side and rear. Mr Limmer said that the application also included the installation of a balcony to the rear and associated external alterations. He said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Limmer said that the application site was located within the development boundary of Grimsby and was acceptable in principle. He said that whilst the bungalow would appear subservient to the extensions, this was not considered to be at the detriment to the visual character of the area, given the private location of the property. Mr Limmer said that the proposed balcony to the rear would not be visible from any public location. He stated that the proposed development would result in any detrimental impacts in terms of visual design. Mr Limmer said that the council's heritage officer had reviewed the application and had raised no objections. He explained that the applicant had worked with the Highways Team and no objections had been raised to the application including the submitted Construction Traffic Management Plan. Mr Limmer said that the proposed development would not cause any harm to neighbouring amenity due to the separation distances. He said that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application but had requested a condition be added

regarding surface water drainage. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Thomas spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that he had lived in the property for twenty years. Mr Thomas said that there was a field at the back, and he had cleaned that. He said that the access was quite narrow but had been made narrower over the years. Mr Thomas said that he had worked around the track for any works carried out. He stated that a concrete lorry could get down there. Mr Thomas said that the development would not result in a detriment to the neighbours. He said that the nearest house to him was seventy metres away. Mr Thomas stated that he maintained the track.

Councillor Bright said that most of the objections to the application were with regard to the access, but the applicant had discussed the access with the Highways Department, and they had a plan in place. He stated that he saw no issues with the application. Councillor Bright proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson 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.41 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 20th September to 17th October 2024.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.42 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.43 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.44 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 12.25pm.