



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 20th March 2024

PLANNING COMMITTEE

27th November 2024 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright, Dawkins (substitute for Parkinson), Emmerson, Goodwin, Hudson, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Patrick, Pettigrew and Shutt

Officers in attendance:

- Jonathan Cadd (Senior Town Planner)
- Paul Chaplin (Trees and Woodlands Officer)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle Fitzgerald (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Richard Limmer (Senior Town Planner)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Keith Thompson (Lead Solicitor)

Others in attendance:

There were 9 members of the public present and one member of the press.

P.45 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.46 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Emmerson declared a pecuniary interest in P.47, item 3, DM/1242/23/FUL and item 6 DM/0846/24/ADV as he is an employee of the Lincolnshire Co-operative Society.

**Item 1 - DM/0450/24/FUL - Weelsby Hall and Stables,
Weelsby Road, Grimsby**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the refurbishment of the Grade Two Listed Building Weelsby Hall for use as a training centre. He explained that the application also included converting and extending the stables to be used for residential care in association with the main site. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He said that representations had also been received from residents who were supportive of the application. Mr Dixon said that the site was located outside of the development boundary of Grimsby but policy 5 of the local plan allowed for development which would promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities. He said that Weelsby Hall was currently used as a specialist centre for people with specialist learning needs and offered various facilities and the current application sought to add to that offering. Mr Dixon stated that the application was acceptable in principle. He explained that Weelsby Hall and its associated buildings were Grade Two Listed and that this meant that policy 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework must be considered. Mr Dixon said that the proposed works to Weelsby Hall were sympathetic to the character of the building and appropriate. He said that the proposed works to the stables would result in their reuse and restoration. Mr Dixon stated that their change of use to residential accommodation would bring them back into use as they were currently underutilised as stables. Mr Dixon said that the works to the stables building would generally be sympathetic to the historical value. He said that the proposed extension to the stables was considered acceptable with a condition included as part of the application requiring that the materials used, would match the existing building as closely as possible and that specific details regarding windows be provided. Mr Dixon said that amendments would also be made to existing parking arrangements in order for there to be adequate spaces for the properties. He explained that those amendments would have little impact visually. Mr Dixon said that the proposed works to both Weelsby Hall and the stables would result in positive benefits and play a part in the retention of the protected assets. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had worked with the council's heritage officer who had raised no objections to the application but had requested various conditions. He explained that Weelsby Hall was well set back within the site and due to the proposed minimal external changes, the development would have little impact on the street scene. Mr Dixon said that the stables were located closer to the street and therefore visible, but it was considered that the works to the stables would have a positive impact on the street scene. He explained that the proposed works to Weelsby Hall would not result in massing and overshadowing of neighbour's properties as there was a good level of separation. Mr Dixon said that the separation distance also meant that the development would not have an adverse

impact in terms of noise and disturbance from any increase in footfall. He said that with regard to the works at the stables, any impact in terms of massing and overshadowing would be minimal. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed extension to the stables would also not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity as there would be a reasonable degree of separation from neighbouring properties and it would match the height of the stables, meaning there would be no issues in terms of overlooking. He said that the changes to the car parking area would also not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed residential accommodation was also considered acceptable for future occupiers. He said that the council's environmental protection officer has recommended that conditions be added regarding the construction hours and that a construction management plan be agreed. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenities. He said that the council's trees and woodlands officer had raised no objection to the application, following more detail being provided within a tree report. Mr Dixon said that the council's ecology officer had raised no objection to the application but had recommended conditions be added. He said that there were no issues in terms of flooding. Mr Dixon said that the council's drainage officer had raised no objections to the application but had recommended conditions. He stated that the council's highways officer had raised no objection to the application but had also requested a condition requiring that a construction traffic management plan be agreed. Mr Dixon said that the application was in accordance with policy 3, 5, 22, 33, 34, 39, 41, 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Smith spoke in support of the application. He said that he was passionate about the local area. Mr Smith said that he worked with a small group of volunteers who worked with the Linkage Community Trust. Mr Smith said that their goal was to support the site. He said that Weelsby Hall was built in 1980 and was a testament to the area's vibrant past and was set in stunning parkland. Mr Smith stated that it was the only grand home in the area that was still accessible to the public. He said that Weelsby Hall's preservation had faced challenges. Mr Smith said that Weelsby Hall would face abandonment if not approved, which had happened to other landmark buildings in the area. He said that Weelsby Hall contained irreplaceable features such as the Italian ceiling which was deteriorating in part. Mr Smith said that the opportunity to get the funding would not come back and would go elsewhere if the application was not approved. He said that the application provided a solution to maintain Weelsby Hall. Mr Smith said that the proposed development would provide local jobs and ensure Weelsby Hall contribution to the community. He stated that there was public interest in preserving Weelsby Hall. Mr Smith said that when the Heritage Days events take place, the Weelsby Hall day were fully booked up. He said Weelsby Hall's significance to local people was clear and people wanted it to endure. Mr Smith asked committee members to approve the application and help save Weelsby Hall.

Mrs Waby spoke as the applicant for the application. She said that she was the Chief Executive for the Linkage Community Trust, which was a registered charity, and their goal was support the future of Weelsby Hall. She said that Linkage Community Trust had been operating from Weelsby Hall for the last forty years. Ms Waby said that Weelsby Hall would provide a space for a safe and welcoming environment for those with autism and the specialist care they offer supported the most vulnerable people. She stated that the Linkage Community Trust was committed to supporting Weelsby Hall. Ms Waby said the restoration of Weelsby Hall would create new jobs in the care sector and other sectors. She said that the application was supported by local policy. Ms Waby said that the application was heritage led investment.

Mr Player spoke as the architect for the application. He said that numerous letters of support had been received regarding the application. Mr Player said that some concerns had also been raised regarding wildlife, trees and drainage and these had all been addressed. He said that the risk of substance had been addressed by the structural engineer. Mr Player stated that the project would enhance job creation in the care sector. He said that there would be no changes to the boundary treatments and no loss of privacy for neighbours. Mr Player said that any increase in noise would be unlikely to affect neighbours. He said that Linkage Community Trust supported people that needed complex care. Mr Player said that the proposed residential accommodation at the site would provide a calm and positive living space. He stated that there would be round the clock carers at the site as well as wardens.

Councillor Hudson said that Weelsby Hall was a magnificent building. He said that when the Linkage Community Trust initially took it over, they were the saviours, and they were now the saviours again. Councillor Hudson said that he was sure that Sir George Sleight who built the hall would be happy that the asset would be protected. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that there was an application for dwellings not too long ago considered by the Planning Committee for a site nearby and it was refused as it was not in keeping with the area. Councillor Lindley said that this application was different as it would enhance the area, and the proposed works needed doing to the building. He stated that he thought it was important that historical buildings were maintained. Councillor Lindley said that the changes would have a minimal impact visually and that the concerns of residents from Brunel Close could be negated by the planting of the trees. He said that there was also a decent level of separation. Councillor Lindley said that the application supported the provision of the services delivered by the Linkage Community Trust and it was the perfect scheme to bring the building back up to date. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with the other councillors, that it was important that historical buildings be preserved. He said that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Patrick said that he was highly supportive of the application. He said that the proposed development would enhance the existing building and support services offered by Linkage Community Trust which were vital services. Councillor Patrick queried why the site was not identified as open countryside as, in a previous application, a nearby site was identified as such.

Mr Dixon said that the site was identified as being outside the development boundary. He said that similar words were used as in the other application. Mr Dixon said that the site was outside of the development boundary and the other application had been for housing, whereas the application being considered was in relation to an existing building. Mr Dixon referred to the National Planning Policy Framework and policy 5 of the local plan which supported this type of development. He stated that there was a clear distinction between the application being considered and the previous application referenced by Councillor Patrick.

Councillor Patrick said that he understood the difference between the applications, but he felt that the term open countryside was an emotive term and if it was good enough that it was used in the report regarding the other application, it should have also been used within the report for this application, in order to be balanced and fair. Councillor Patrick sought clarification on why the report stated that the site bordered Welholme Road.

Mr Dixon responded that there was an error with the report, and it should be Weelsby Road, not Welholme Road.

Councillor Patrick said that he was supportive of the application. He said that residents had also rightfully objected, and he thought that to put those residents' minds at ease, a site visit should take place. Councillor Patrick proposed that a site visit take place.

Councillor Shutt said that he thought planning officers and the applicant should be congratulated on the application, as there was such detail included. He said that it was a lovely building, and he understood the concerns of residents as when you buy a home, you think nothing will change and it can be frustrating if it does. Councillor Shutt said that changes happen, and a lot of mitigation was included as part of the application. He said that he would like to see a line of communication set up between residents and the applicant, so they can report any issues. Councillor Shutt said that he thought it was important that residents had a point of contact. He stated that he thought the development was a great opportunity.

Councillor Emmerson said that he agreed with what the other councillors had said. He said that too many buildings in the area are going to rack and ruin. Councillor Emmerson said that he had been very impressed with the facilities when he had visited Weelsby Hall a few years ago. He

said that he would be voting in support of the proposal of approving the application.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 2 - DM/0451/24/LBC - Weelsby Hall and Stables, Weelsby Road, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought listed building consent for the refurbishment of the Grade Two Listed Building Weelsby Hall with internal alterations for use as a training centre and to convert and extend the stables for use as residential care in association with the main site. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He reiterated that the proposed works for the listed buildings were considered acceptable and would help sustain their long-term viability. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policy 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Smith spoke in support of the application. He said that the Linkage Community Trust was a registered charity which supported those with autism. He said that Linkage Community Trust was established in 1976 and that they had been operating from Weelsby Hall for the last forty years. Mr Smith said that deterioration to the building had occurred, and the goal was to preserve Weelsby Hall. He stated that the investment would rescue the buildings. Mr Smith said that the project's legacy would be that the Weelsby Hall be saved, and jobs would be created. He explained that in the upstairs bedrooms, partitions were put in and the plan was to take those out. Mr Smith said that the ceiling had also come down in parts of the billiard room and there were cracks in the drawing room. He stated that it wasn't Linkage Community Trust who had caused the damage, but it was possible to restore it.

Councillor Dawkins said that Weelsby Hall was a very important historical building and too many of those had been lost over the years. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley 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.)

Councillor Emmerson left the meeting at this point.

Item 3 – DM/1242/23/FUL – Highfield House, Stallingborough Road, Immingham

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission to erect a single storey convenience store with creation of access, car parking and associated hard and soft landscaping. He stated that the application was linked to the Beale Homes application. Mr Limmer said that the site was located within the development area of Immingham and was allocated for housing. He explained that the proposed development would therefore be a departure from the local plan but as it was only a small area of housing land that would be lost, this would not be considered detrimental. Mr Limmer said that as the rest of the wider site was to be used for housing, it was considered that the proposed development of a convenience store would complement that. He said that the applicant had submitted a detailed Retail Impact Assessment which had been assessed by an independent consultant who had determined that the addition of the convenience store would not have a detrimental effect. Mr Limmer said that it had also been determined that there were no existing premises or sites in the area that would be suitable and available to accommodate the proposed convenience store. He said that the application had therefore satisfied the requirements of a sequential test. Mr Limmer stated that it was therefore considered that the departure from the local plan was justified, and the proposed development was acceptable in principle. He said that there were no concerns regarding impact on neighbours, as the housing development that would neighbour the premises had been designed with the premises in mind. Mr Limmer said that the council's environmental protection officer had raised no objection to the application but had recommended a condition be added for a Noise Impact Assessment to be agreed. He said that the proposed development would sit nicely within the housing site and would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Mr Limmer stated that the council's highways officer had raised no objection to the application but had recommended that conditions be attached to the application regarding construction details and that a construction traffic management plan be agreed. He explained that a detailed drainage scheme had been submitted which was considered acceptable by the council's drainage officer. Mr Limmer said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 36, 38, 39 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Wilkinson spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that the site was part of the wider development for the south east of Immingham. Mr Wilkinson said that the Lincolnshire Co-operative was a successful cooperative and had been serving communities in Lincolnshire for sixteen years. He said that the proposed convenience store would support Immingham. Mr Wilkinson said that the Lincolnshire Co-operative had been operating in the surrounding area, and they wanted to replicate that for Immingham. He said that in recent years, other stores had been developed which were vital throughout the pandemic. Mr Wilkinson said that the proposed new houses would need a nearby

convenience store. He said that planning officers had determined that the proposed development was acceptable in principle. Mr Wilkinson asked committee members to support the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he had initial reservations about the store on Waltham Road, as it was located within a residential area, but the store was now open and had fitted in well with the area. Councillor Lindley said that the proposed store looked identical to the store on Waltham Road. He said that he thought the store would have a minimal impact on residential amenity and there was also parking available. Councillor Lindley stated that he thought the proposed store would fit in with the area and after having seen the finished product of the store on Waltham Road, he was happy to support the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt agreed with Councillor Lindley. He said that there was always feedback when new homes were built that there weren't amenities built as well, so he thought it was good that a store was to be opened in the area. Councillor Shutt referred to condition eleven in the report, and asked whether planning officers discussed the internal lighting with the applicant.

Mr Limmer said that planning officers didn't have control over the internal lighting that was used. He said that for external lighting, such as advertisement signs, consent would be required, and a separate application would need to be submitted.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright agreed with what the other councillors had said. He said that due to the location of the proposed premise, it would hopefully lead to a reduction in car journeys as people would hopefully walk to the store.

Councillor Patrick said that he was fully supportive of the application. He said that shops do become part of the community. Councillor Patrick queried why the application was being brought before the Planning Committee as he thought three objections were needed in order for an application to be considered by Planning Committee.

Mr Limmer responded that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee as it was a technical departure from the local plan.

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 4 – DM/0769/22/FUL – Land Between the Willows Caravan Park and ‘The Copse’, Barton Street, Laceby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the construction of a new foul sewer and associated works. Mr Limmer stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Laceby Parish Council. He said that the proposed development was located within the open countryside. Mr Limmer said that the proposed sewer would support the Willows Caravan Park which had permission for both caravans and lodges. He said that policy 5 allowed for developments that supported rural leisure and tourism and, as this proposed development would support the Willows Caravan Park, it was acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer said that the application was submitted as the Environment Agency had indicated that the number of lodges approved for the Willow Caravan Park should be served by the sewerage network. He said that concerns regarding the additional flow and pressure on the existing sewer network had been raised by Laceby Parish Council who stated that the sewer network through the village was over capacity and flooded. Mr Limmer said that Anglian Water had been consulted and had raised no objection to the application but had asked for conditions to be added. He added that Anglian Water stated that the existing sewer and treatment station had the capacity that was needed. He stated that the council's drainage officer had also reviewed the application and had recommended that there be storage capacity at the pumping station for 40,000 litres and that a telemetry system be in place so that in high rainfall events and when the sewer was at capacity the pumping station would stop, so as to not add to the flows, and only start again once the levels had dropped. Mr Limmer said that the council's drainage officer raised no objection to the application but had requested conditions be added. He explained that the proposed development would have no visual or physical impact to neighbouring amenity or the character of the area as the foul sewer and pumping station would be underground and therefore not visible. Mr Limmer said that council's environmental health officer and council's highways officer had recommended that conditions be added to the application regarding the construction phase. He said that the council's ecology officer had raised no objection to the application, but a Great Crested Newt survey was needed to be undertaken prior to the works commencing. Mr Limmer said that an additional condition was also needed requiring that a management plan for the sewer be agreed as it would be privately controlled. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 33, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hudson said that something had to be done and that it was only yesterday that he was shown a photo of sewage going into the river. Councillor Hudson said that the Environment Agency was pushing for this and whilst he took on board the comments from Laceby Parish Council, he did think that the scheme that was proposed by the drainage officer would solve those concerns. Councillor Hudson said that he did

not see how the Planning Committee could vote against the application. He said that he did have concerns regarding the closure of roads. Councillor Hudson queried whether the proposed works would mean more closures on Barton Street. He thought the Planning Committee had to approve the application, but he hoped the work was completed quickly as he didn't want Barton Street to suffer.

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald said that a Traffic Management Scheme would need to be submitted by the applicant. She said that the Highways Department would work with the applicant to try and ensure minimal delays. Ms Hattle Fitzgerald stated that potentially it could mean a lane closure at the edge of the carriageway, but that would be determined once the scheme was submitted.

Councillor Hudson he was reassured by that and proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that there had been awful delays on Barton Street over the years and that perhaps working at night would work better. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that an application shouldn't be judged on potential disruption to the highways. He said that if that reason were used, nothing would ever get done. Councillor Lindley said that the drainage officer had recommended mitigation based on the concerns raised by Laceby Parish Council.

Councillor Bright said that the figures didn't seem to add up as the Environment Agency figures showed that there had been 1000 hours of spillages that had occurred, but then other figures showed that there was spare capacity. Councillor Bright commented that both the council's drainage officer and Anglian Water said there was capacity, but they had provided no evidence of such. He stated that the data seemed unclear regarding whether there was spare capacity. Councillor Bright said that in the last three years, there had been spillages and whilst he was not objecting to the idea that something needed doing, and that the council's drainage officer's plan might help with the additional flows that would arise from the sewerage system serving the lodges, there was an existing problem with the current flows.

Mr Limmer said that planning officers had to listen to the consultees. He reiterated that Anglian Water said there was capacity, and the application had been reviewed by the council's drainage engineers.

Councillor Bright said that there appeared to be a disconnect between the council's drainage officers and Anglian Water as the figures didn't seem to align.

Mr Dixon said that officers had asked Anglian Water to check again that they were happy with the application. He said that the council's drainage officer had also been involved. Mr Dixon said that the council's drainage

officer had proposed mitigation. He said that whilst he understood Councillor Bright's comments, all consultees were happy with the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he understood the points raised by Councillor Bright, but the Planning Committee had been given reassurance from the council's drainage officer. He stated that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he understood the concerns raised by Laceby Parish Council, but he hoped the comments from the council's drainage officer would have allayed some of their concerns. He said that he thought the storage tank would alleviate the problems. Councillor Pettigrew said that he did have concerns about the impact on traffic and roadworks on Barton Street. He said that he did not think that could be avoided but it did need to be managed well. Councillor Pettigrew said that there was a condition about protecting the footpath and it being closed, but nothing on how long it would need to be closed for. He queried what the timescales would be. Councillor Pettigrew stated that it was important that information regarding timescales were communicated to the public.

Mr Limmer said that when the application regarding closure of the footpath was submitted, the duration of the closure would be considered at that time.

Councillor Patrick said that he was broadly supportive of the application. He said that whilst he appreciated that people more qualified than him were happy with the application, he would have still liked more detail to have been shared with the Planning Committee. Councillor Patrick said that were the worse to happen, then the local authority could end up being left with the cost.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 5 – DM/0752/24/FUL – 1 - 2 Great Coates Road, Healing

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the erection of two detached dwellings with solar panels and roof lights. He said that the application also sought planning permission to make alterations to the existing vehicular access and associated works. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from a Ward Councillor. He said that planning permission had previously been granted for the application site which was extant until April 2025. Mr Dixon said that if the current application was approved, that planning permission would be replaced with the latest one. He stated that the main issue was the issue

of principle of the development. Mr Dixon said that the application site was located outside of the development boundary for Healing and was located within the open countryside. He said that the location of the application site was not considered unsustainable. Mr Dixon said that as the application site was located within open countryside, specific criteria needed to be satisfied in order for the development to be able to be supported. He said that the proposed development did not satisfy the criteria. Mr Dixon said that the proposed development would result in the built form of the village being extended into the open countryside. He said that whilst there was extant planning permission for the application site, that did not justify the proposed development. Mr Dixon said that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties due to the somewhat isolated location of the application site. He said that the proposed development would also be acceptable for future occupiers. Mr Dixon said that the council's highways officer had reviewed the application and raised no objections. He stated that the application site was not within a flood risk area. Mr Dixon said that the council's drainage officer had raised no objections to the application but had requested conditions. He said that the council's ecology officer and council's trees and woodlands officer had also raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon said that the issue of principle of the development remained. He stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Smith spoke as the agent for the application. He said that whilst the application site was not located within the development boundary, there was a presumption of development as planning permission had already been granted for the site. Mr Smith stated that the site was located in a suitable area and was also on the bus route. He said that the applicant wanted the dwellings to have solar panels and wanted to reuse any rainwater. Mr Smith stated that this could only benefit the area's green ambitions. He said that the site was also not located in a flood risk area. Mr Smith said that the access to the site would be widened by six and half metres to allow for traffic to flow freely and the proposed development would also have off street car parking. He said that the site already had planning permission for one dwelling, and that the proposed development would instead be for two, but both of the proposed dwellings would be of a lower height than the dwelling that was approved under the initial application. Mr Smith said that in terms of the consultees, there had been no statutory objections received against the application and the parish council was also in support of the application. Mr Smith asked committee members to support the application.

Mr Peterson spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that he had been granted planning permission for the site for a large four-bedroom house to be built with a detached garage. Mr Peterson said that his circumstances had now changed, and he wanted to now build two dwellings on the site, one being a one bedroom property, and the other being a three bedroom property. He said that the proposed changes, would allow his family to stay together. Mr Peterson said that the scale of

the proposed two dwellings would be a reduction in size to that what had already been approved. He said that the footprint on the plot would remain as was. Mr Peterson said that the reason behind the officer's recommendation was due to the principle of the development, but the Planning Committee had previously granted planning permission for development at the site.

Councillor Hudson said that the initial application for the development was passed by one vote. He said that when he initially saw that the applicant was asking for an additional dwelling, he didn't think it would work. Councillor Hudson said that the applicant explained the application to him as he is a Ward Councillor for the Wolds Ward, and he had also now heard the planning officer's objection. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Dawkins said that he initially was in support of the planning officer's recommendation to refuse the application, but he was unsure now. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Bright said that he saw nothing wrong with the application, however, the site was outside of the development boundary, but the applicant did already have planning permission. He queried whether, if the current application was refused, the applicant could still build the four-bedroom house which he had permission for.

Mr Dixon responded that the applicant could do that.

Councillor Bright said that he thought two low level dwellings, would be better than one four-bedroom dwelling. He said that he was leaning towards supporting approval of the application.

Councillor Patrick said that he thought the application was blatant urban creep and would be detrimental to Healing as a village. He said that it could lead to pressure for more development in villages and the strategic gap could also end up being encroached on. Councillor Patrick stated that he was in complete opposition to the application.

Councillor Goodwin thanked Councillor Hudson for calling the application in so it could be considered by the Planning Committee. She said that the proposal looked better than the previous proposal. Councillor Goodwin proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he had not been a member of the Planning Committee when the initial application was considered, so was unaware what the reasons were for the application being approved. He said that he wanted to support the application and was supportive of the green effort that had been put in, but the site was outside of the development boundary. Councillor Kaczmarek said that he did not think that he could support the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he was undecided regarding the application. He said that he thought the proposal was sympathetic to the area and there was existing planning permission for a larger home than what was proposed. Councillor Pettigrew said that whilst it was not a material planning consideration, approval of the application would allow a family to live in the location where they wanted to live. He said that the parish council also supported the application. Councillor Pettigrew said that he had not decided, but thought if the application was to be approved, then a condition regarding permitted development would need to be considered.

Councillor Bright said that were it an application where there wasn't already outline planning permission granted, he would not support it, but he thought what was proposed was better than what planning permission had already been granted for.

Councillor Shutt sought clarification on whether the parish council supported the application as the report stated they had made no objection, which indicated they had taken a neutral position rather than one of support.

The Chair stated that the parish council had made no objections to the application.

Councillor Shutt thought the proposal was better than the previous one. He said that he did have concerns, but after having listened to the applicant who had explained the reasons for the changes, he was more minded to support the application. Councillor Shutt said that he was however concerned about urban creep.

Councillor Lindley said that as outline planning permission had been granted, it was difficult to oppose the current application. He said he disagreed with the officer's report that the proposed development would detract from the open character of Healing as the site was directly opposite Healing Academy. Councillor Lindley said that with that in mind, he did not think the proposed development would detract from the open character of the area. He said that he would support the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he was against the application when he had initially heard about it, but his thought process now was that the proposal would mean a reduction in development at the site and the overall massing would be less.

Mr Dixon clarified that the application site not only had outline planning permission but a reserved matters application had also been granted.

Councillor Emmerson said that there had been no neighbour representations submitted regarding the application which was quite rare.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he knew the area quite well and he understood the points raised for the application and against. He said that there had been no neighbours' objections to the application. Councillor Pettigrew stated that he would be voting in favour of the application.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Dixon outlined proposed conditions.

The Chair asked that a condition be added that permitted development rights be removed.

Councillor Goodwin and Councillor Hudson agreed to the proposed conditions by Mr Dixon and the additional condition proposed by the Chair.

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.)

Councillor Emmerson left the meeting at this point.

Item 6 - DM/0846/24/ADV – Former St John Fisher RC Church, Waltham Road, Grimsby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought retrospective advertisement consent for the installation of one internally illuminated 'lozenge' sign on a newly constructed convenience store. Mr Limmer said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He said that the sign was considered visually acceptable and would sit alongside other signage at the site, approved under DM/0587/24/ADV. Mr Limmer said that the application site was located near to a conservation area, but the council's heritage officer had raised no objections to the application. He stated that there were no safety concerns in relation to the proposed sign. Mr Limmer said that the council's highways officer had raised no objection to the application but had recommended a condition. He said that the applicant had agreed to have the sign turned off when the store was not operational in order to limit disturbance. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hudson said that it was a similar sign to those seen on other buildings and was not particularly large. He said that the sign would also be turned off when the shop was closed. Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright said that the fact that the sign would be turned off when the shop was closed was a good thing. He said that it was low level lighting, and he saw no issue with the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he agreed with what other members had said. He didn't understand why the sign was not included as part of a lighting plan.

Mr Limmer said that he could not answer that query.

Councillor Lindley said that he was aware of the concerns raised by residents regarding the lighting. He found it bizarre that the sign would be on the side of the building, as he thought it would be on the front, to catch the eye of those passing by. Councillor Lindley said that he was reassured by the timing restrictions. He stated that he would support the application.

Councillor Patrick said that he thought having a sign on the side of the building was a bit strange. He said that he could not see the sign being fundamentally detrimental to neighbours or the area as a whole. Councillor Patrick said that there did appear to be issues as to why some shops needed planning permission for illuminated signs and some did not.

Mr Dixon said that some illuminated signs can be deemed acceptable if they are placed at a low-level height. He said that there could be some signs on some shops that were in breach of planning regulations.

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 7 - DM/0182/24/OUT – R/O 38 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Cadd introduced the outline application and explained that it sought planning permission to erect two dwellings with associated access and parking. Mr Cadd explained that all matters were reserved except the access. He said that a new footpath had also been proposed as part of the application but referred committee members to their supplementary agenda as this element of the application had now been removed due to issues over ownership. Mr Cadd said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received, including an objection from Humberston Village Council. He said that there had been a number of back land developments in Humberston Avenue and that the proposed development would be located within the rear of 38 Humberston Avenue, which was within the development boundary of Humberston. Mr Cadd said that the proposed development was acceptable in principle. He said that development had occurred within

the rear gardens of several properties on Humberston Avenue. Mr Cadd said that the application site would face Parklands Avenue and therefore it could be argued that the application was not for traditional backland development as it would have direct access onto what would become an adopted highway. He explained that the density in the specific area as a result of the development would not be considered unreasonable with there being fifteen dwellings per hectare. Mr Cadd said that there were no issues with the garage being against the boundary fence as shown on the indicative plan. However, the overall design, scale and position of the proposed dwellings would be determined at the reserved matters stage. Mr Cadd said that a tree survey had been conducted at the application site. He said that whilst a number of trees on the application site would be removed to accommodate the proposed development, the high quality and protected trees would remain. Mr Cadd stated that the council's trees and woodlands officer had not objected to the application but had required that conditions be attached to the application outlining that the remaining trees on the site be protected. Mr Cadd said that the council's ecology officer had raised no objections to the application but had also requested conditions be attached to the application. He said that access to the application site would be from Parklands Avenue and this had been deemed acceptable. He said that the revised plans that had been submitted showed wider access points, parking and turning areas within both plots which would allow cars to enter, turn, and leave in a forward gear. Mr Cadd stated that Parklands Avenue also had good visibility, despite a tree being placed in the adjoining verge. He said that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application but had recommended a condition be attached to the application requiring that a construction traffic management plan be agreed prior to any development taking place. Mr Cadd said that the car parking provision proposed was also considered to be acceptable. He said that the indicative plan showed that the proposed two dwellings could fit onto the site without causing undue impacts on the surrounding area or neighbouring amenities. Mr Cadd explained that originally the application included a new footpath which would link the application site to Humberston Avenue, but this had been subsequently removed due to ownership issues. He said that the footpath was not required to make the development safe and the council's highways officer had not raised any objection to the application as a result of this change. Mr Cadd referred committee members to the additional condition outlined in the supplementary papers. He said that the applicant had agreed to enter into a Section 106 agreement regarding the construction and maintenance of the footpath, but with this now omitted from the application, a Section 106 agreement was no longer needed. Mr Cadd stated that the application was in accordance with policies 3, 4, 5, 22, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. He said that as the footpath had now been removed from the application, re-consultation needed to take place. He said that the application was recommended for approval with the final decision to be delegated back to the Assistant Director Regeneration to allow for the re-consultation to take place.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that what was proposed was relatively straightforward. Mr Deakins said that the proposed development was not backland development and was infill development in its true sense. Mr Deakins said that a reasonable sized garden would be retained for the host property. He said that no amenity issues were foreseen and the trees that had tree protection orders would be retained at the site. Mr Deakins stated that the application was supported by the council's trees and woodlands officer. He said that a few comments were raised by neighbours regarding the footpath, but events had now taken place, and the footpath was not part of the application. Mr Deakins said that he hoped committee members would support the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he had made his views clear in the past regarding backland development in Humberston Avenue. He said that in terms of the specific application, the development was of a good design and fitted in well. Councillor Lindley said that it would be difficult to find anything to object to the application on. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that the parish council did object to backland development, but he did not consider the application to be that type of development. He said that he thought the parish council could have looked at the application differently. Councillor Hudson said that if there was the chance for more footpath, he would like to see that.

Councillor Dawkins said that it was another development that Humberston doesn't want and doesn't need. He said that he thought as the Council now had a five-year housing supply, he thought that would solve the issue. Councillor Dawkins said that he had concerns regarding the footpath. He stated that he would not support the application.

Councillor Bright said that he was not in favour of the continuing of backland infill development, but this development was slightly different. He said that he did not think there would be an issue of over intensification as a result of the development. Councillor Bright said that he saw no reason to object to the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that the objections spoke for themselves. He said that it was too cramped in, and that Humberston Avenue was becoming a rat run. Councillor Emmerson said that every square metre seemed to be built on. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Goodwin said that trees would be cut down as part of the application and we seemed to just be brushing past that. She said that she would like to see data provided on how many trees were cut down in the area. Councillor Goodwin said that too many trees were being cut down to allow for two houses. She seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he was minded to support the application but understood the objections to the application.

Mr Cadd said that policy 5 supported development of sites located within the development boundary. He said that some trees would be removed but the council's trees and woodlands officer had assessed that and raised no objection. Mr Cadd said that whilst it was unfortunate that one of the trees had been removed, the applicant had not done anything wrong by doing that as it was a tree which did not have a Tree Preservation Order. Mr Cadd said that there had been lots of discussion regarding the footpath, but it could not be adopted due to it going on third party land. He said that as a result of this, this small section of third party land, where there would be no footpath would force pedestrians into the carriageway, in an unexpected location and it was felt that it would be a more dangerous situation than having no footpath at all.

Councillor Pettigrew said that when considering material planning considerations, he could not see how the Planning Committee could object to the application. He said that were the application to go to appeal, he wasn't sure the Planning Inspector would agree with the Planning Committee. Councillor Pettigrew seconded the proposal to approve the application.

The Chair asked Councillor Emmerson and Councillor Goodwin to outline their reasons to refuse the application.

Mr Dixon queried whether it was for reasons of visual harm, removal of trees, lack of footpath and highways concerns.

Councillor Emmerson and Councillor Goodwin agreed to those reasons.

Councillor Patrick said that he would be voting against the proposal of refusal, as he didn't think the reasons outlined were good enough for grounds to refuse the application. He said that the development would slot in quite well. Councillor Patrick said that he didn't think the development would make a big difference in terms of the character of the area and the footpath was not grounds for refusal.

The committee took a vote and upon a vote, 3 voted for and 8 voted against the application being refused.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions, subject to further reconsultation and, subject to no new planning issues being raised, the issue of the decision notice delegated to the Assistant Director Regeneration.

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

Item 8 - DM/0373/23/FUL - Land at Louth Road, New Waltham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the variation of condition two pursuant to DM/1240/21/FUL to allow for the repositioning of plots, amendments to plot numbering and changes to house types resulting in the amended layout of plots and parking to accommodate foul water easement and highway details. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from New Waltham Parish Council. He said that the principle of the development was already established due to the application site being allocated for housing in the local plan as well as the original planning permission that was granted for the site. Mr Dixon said that the proposed amendments included the removal of the one-bedroom houses to instead be two bedroom houses as a result of the one bedroom house types not being a viable option for affordable housing provision for the future provider. He explained that this would result in a repositioning of the plots with amendments to the plot numbering. Mr Dixon said that the layout would also be altered to accommodate for the house type change. He explained that this would also result in some changes to the landscaping. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed amendments would be minor in nature as the overall number of houses would remain as approved. He said that the proposed amendments would also mean that the road layout and some landscaping features would be altered or removed to accommodate the foul water easement which was considered essential to the scheme as a whole. Mr Dixon said that the proposed amendments were not uncommon on residential new build sites and no adverse harm would be caused to the character of the area or visual amenity as a result. He said that the council's highways officer and council's trees and woodlands officers had reviewed the amendments and raised no objections. Mr Dixon said that the council's drainage officer had requested confirmation that the drainage strategy would not change as a result of the proposed amendments. That detail had now been provided and the council's drainage officer had raised no objections. Mr Dixon stated that information had been provided to Anglian Water regarding the easement details, but planning officers were awaiting their response. He explained that there had been no changes made to the Section 106 agreement agreed under the initial planning application DM/1240/21/FUL. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Pettigrew said that there was an objection from the parish council, but the concerns outlined were not relevant to the current application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek sought clarification on how many one-bedroom houses would be lost as a result of the proposed changes and how many two bedrooms would be gained.

Mr Dixon responded that there was proposed to be 23 three-bedroom houses and 22 two-bedroom houses.

Councillor Bright said that as a result of the proposed changes, the 16 one-bedroom properties would be lost. He said that affordable housing was a massive issue, and it was difficult to get on the property ladder and this change could put some people having their own home out of reach. Councillor Bright said that he didn't think there was any material planning consideration objections.

Councillor Shutt said that he found the report confusing regarding changing the one-bedroom houses to two-bedroom houses. He asked who the provider was.

Mr Dixon said that the council's Housing Officer on the original application stage was not so keen on one bedroomed affordable units and to this end two bedroom houses would be a better provision.

Councillor Shutt said that he understood Councillor Bright's concerns but feedback from officers who are experts was that two bedrooms houses plus were needed for a variety of reasons.

Councillor Patrick said that there was a shortage of one-bedroom properties in the area, and he thought the original application had more of a variety of housing. He said that on balance he was happier with the original application and would therefore not be supporting the current 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 9 - DM/0782/24/ADV – Willys, High Cliff Road, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought advertisement consent to display one internally illuminated fascia sign above a proposed canopy to the front. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee as the applicant was an elected member of North East Lincolnshire Council. He said that the sign was considered to be visually acceptable and would be minor in scale. Mr Dixon explained that the application site was located within the Cleethorpes Central Seafront Conservation Area. He said that the council's heritage officer had raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon stated that there were no safety concerns in relation to the proposed sign. He said that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application but had recommended a condition. Mr Dixon said that the application was in accordance with policies 22 and 39 of the North East

Lincolnshire Local Plan and was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins 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.)

Item 10 - DM/0772/24/TPO - 4 Queens Parade, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the Tree Preservation Order application and explained that it sought permission to cut back a Sycamore Tree. He said that it was proposed to reduce the lateral spread along the Queen's Parade boundary to the streetlight and maintain a minimum of a four-metre radial arc over the car park of the Waterfront residential complex, from the main stem, cutting back to viable secondary growth points. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He said that the reasoning behind the proposed works was due to bird droppings going into the car park and causing paintwork damage to vehicles. Mr Dixon said that previous canopy reduction work had been carried out on the tree under the approved application DM/0272/18/TPO. He said that bird droppings were the reason to undertake the proposed works and this was considered to be a valid reason and reasonable. Mr Dixon said that it was considered that the proposed works would maintain the trees visual amenity value in the street scene as well as address the reasons for the works. Mr Dixon said that it was accepted that there would be successive applications for the management of canopy encroachment over the parking spaces affected. He explained that it had been five years since the previous works of reducing the canopy had taken place and that given the relationship between the Sycamore tree and the adjacent parking spaces, a 5 year period in between works taking place was considered reasonable. Mr Dixon stated that the removal of the tree or any excessive canopy reduction would be unreasonable. Mr Dixon said that the objections had been taken into account. He explained that the issue of ownership had been raised by objectors, but anyone could apply for consent to carry out works to a tree, and it would then be up to the applicant, for them to get the necessary permission if the application was granted by the Planning Committee. Mr Dixon stated that the ecological issues had also been raised by objectors, but those undertaking the works would have to adhere to separate legislation regarding ecology.

Mr Chaplin said that the applicant wanted to cut the tree back into their land to alleviate any issues. He said that it was acknowledged that the tree needed managing. Mr Chaplin said that the application was not proposing to cut the canopy back that far and the tree would still be a visible feature in the street scene. He stated that the applicant was within

their rights to manage the canopy. Mr Chaplin said that the application was in line with previous applications. He said that the works that were being proposed were not unreasonable.

Mr Dixon said that the proposed works to the Sycamore tree were reasonable and followed previous management of the tree. He stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Collet spoke in objection to the application. He said that the Sycamore tree was a landmark tree with a Tree Protection Order. Mr Collet said that its size and symmetry enhanced Queens Parade and it was there long before the development. He said that no consideration was given to the tree when the development was built out. Mr Collet said that the tree was also home to different species. He said that what was proposed was to radically prune the tree. Mr Collet referred to a previous application where it stated that 'in discussions with the applicant, the removal of the tree or canopy reduction was not considered acceptable' but the application was approved. He said that the very fact that bird dropping was cited as the reason to prune the tree, showed that birds were using the tree. Mr Collett said that the previous works to the tree had negatively impacted it and it was clearly not asymmetrical. He said that if the proposed works were undertaken, this would be accentuated. Mr Collet said that he had offered up other solutions such as moving the bin storage under the tree or getting car covers. He said that further destruction of the tree would not solve the issue and due to the regrowth, all that was proposed was a temporary solution that would need to be reviewed again in five years. Mr Collet queried who would be liable if there were problems with the tree as a result of the pruning.

Ms Jones spoke in support of the application. She said that the majority of the residents at the Waterfront loved the tree and had looked at other alternatives such as car covers, but due to weather, they would be blown off. She said that Acer Trees were very sympathetic with the work they do.

Councillor Bright referred to the North East Lincolnshire Tree Strategy which outlined that the nuisance of bird droppings was not a sufficient reason to prune trees. He could not understand why that policy had not been applied. Councillor Bright said that he visited the site and thought that if the bin storage was moved to where the tree was, then the car parking spaces could be in that area instead. He said that the tree was cut back in 2018, and now it was proposed to be cut back again, so cutting the tree back was not a permanent solution. Councillor Bright proposed that the application be deferred in order to allow for the different parties to have discussions.

Councillor Hudson said that he understood Councillor Bright's point, but the works had been done before and the tree had grown back. He said that the council's trees and woodlands officer was happy with the works and the works might need doing every five years as the tree needed

managing. Councillor Hudson stated that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Patrick said that the tree was over the boundary and onto someone else's land. He said that felt that the Planning Committee were being dragged into a neighbour's dispute. Councillor Patrick queried the material planning considerations for the application.

Mr Dixon said that the application was a Tree Preservation Order application, and the consideration was whether the proposed works would have an adverse impact on amenity. He stated that the council's trees and woodlands officer was of the opinion it wouldn't.

Councillor Patrick said that he slightly disagreed with Councillor Bright, but did think that deferring the application was a good idea as it would allow the different parties time to have discussions. Councillor Patrick said that he was minded however to approve the application.

Councillor Goodwin queried whether it would be easier to move the bin storage. She said that she wanted to allow the different parties, the time to have discussions. Councillor Goodwin seconded the proposal to defer the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he had concerns about deferring the application as discussions had already taken place and no agreement had been reached between the different parties., He said that he didn't want things to get worse with the tree whilst further discussions took place.

Councillor Shutt said that it was a lovely tree and deferring the application could help. He said that he thought the tree needed managing and would support approving the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred.

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

P.48

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 18th October – 13th November 2024

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.49 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.50 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.51 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 12.45pm.