



PLANNING COMMITTEE

26th November 2025 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright, Emmerson, Hudson, Humphrey, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Goodwin (substitute for Mickleburgh), Pettigrew, Shutt and Silvester (substitute for Parkinson).

Officers in attendance:

- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Cheryl Jarvis (Development Manager)
- Matthew Chaplin (Public Rights of Way Mapping Officer)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Tracy Lovejoy (Locum Lawyer)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

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

P.46 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received for this meeting from Councillors Mickleburgh and Parkinson.

P.47 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Humphrey declared a pecuniary interest in P.50 Item 1 DM/0657/25/FUL, Item 4 DM/0814/25/FULA and Item 5 DM/0810/25/FULA as his spouse worked for the agent.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she knew the applicant for P.50 Item 4 DM/0814/25/FULA. Mrs Lovejoy advised her to declare an interest and leave the room during the debate. Councillor Goodwin clarified that this was just as an acquaintance and that she had not seen him in several years. Ms Lovejoy said she was happy to leave the decision to Councillor Goodwin. Councillor Goodwin

declared a non-pecuniary interest and participated in the debate for the application.

P.48 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 29th October 2025 be approved as a correct record.

P.49 EXTINGUISHMENT OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH, HUMBERSTON

Mr Chaplin introduced the report from the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure seeking the making of an Order to extinguish part of Humberston Public Footpath 53 as shown on Appendix 1. Mr Chaplin outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the Order and the recommendations as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers.

Councillor Hudson said that what was proposed was a common-sense approach. He proposed that the recommendations be approved.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the recommendations.

The committee took a vote and upon a vote, voted unanimously to approve the recommendations as set out in the report.

RESOLVED –

1. That the making of an Order in accordance with Highways Act 1980 Section 118 be approved.
2. That the deletion Order be confirmed as made, subject to there being no objections or in the event of objections which cannot be resolved and withdrawn, for the Order to be referred to the Planning Inspectorate for determination.

Councillor Humphrey left the meeting.

Mr Chaplin left the meeting.

P.50 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Item 1 - DM/0657/25/FUL – 174 – 176 Cleethorpe Road, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from Ward Councillors. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the

application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the building used to be a lighting shop until the beginning of the year and the upstairs had not been used for decades. Mr Deakins said that the local plan supported residential use above shops, and it was worth noting that the building previously had permission for three flats to be above it. He said that there was more chance of letting two smaller retail units, than one large one and that was the reason for the division on the ground floor. Mr Deakins stated that the housing officer agreed with the layout. He said that houses of multiple occupancy were some of the most heavily regulated accommodations someone could live in, and they were subject to licensing arrangements. Mr Deakins said that whilst he noted the comments from the Ward Councillors, he did find that with applications regarding houses of multiple occupancy, there was an assumption from lots of people that they encouraged anti-social behaviour, but they were people's homes, and they were no different to any other resident's accommodation. He said that in his experience, the majority of people that lived in houses of multiple occupancy tended to not have a car, and the building was located within a sustainable area with bus routes. Mr Deakins stated that there was no need for someone to have a car to live in the house of multiple occupancy. He explained that the fact that there was no parking provision would be made clear at the marketing stage of the project. Mr Deakins said that waste collection at the premise would be undertaken by a private commercial company. He said that the proposed development would bring the building back into use which was a good thing. Mr Deakins asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Beasant spoke as the Ward Councillor for the East Marsh Ward. He said that when he had called the application in to be determined by the Planning Committee, it was not clear within the plans what bin storage there would be. Councillor Beasant said that he also had concerns about other issues, such as the potential for bins to be at the front of the building, blocking people walking past as well as concerns about potential fly tipping. He said that he also had concerns about the rear of the premises and fly tipping. Councillor Beasant stated that one of his main concerns was the lack of parking. He explained that parking was already going to be reduced significantly in the area due to the Cleethorpe Road bus lane and it was already bad in the area for parking. Councillor Beasant was aware that there would be cycle storage at the premises, but he agreed with the Civic Society and thought that a nine-bedroom house of multiple occupancy was too much. He said that whilst some of the residents might not have a car, some could have work vehicles, and we could end up with a situation where more than nine cars needed to park. Councillor Beasant said that he knew why houses of multiple occupancy were being proposed as there was a need for single person accommodation, but he was against the pulling down of the high-rise flats, and if the flats had been renovated, the current surge

in houses of multiple occupancy wouldn't be happening. He asked committee members to refuse the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that this was a difficult application to consider, and she understood both Councillor Beasant's points of view and Mr Deakins points of view. She said that whether you liked houses of multiple occupancy or not, they seemed to be here to stay, because single accommodation was needed. Councillor Goodwin said that she was leaning towards supporting approval of the application as the would not be left to rack and ruin if it was developed. Councillor Goodwin said that she was unsure but was leaning towards supporting approval of the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that he echoed the points raised by Councillor Beasant. He said that it was proposed that there be two retail units, but he was unsure what retail units they were going to be. Councillor Emmerson said that the building was right next to a derelict building which was prone to arson, and he had huge safety concerns. He said that there were also incidents of fly tipping and graffiti on Strand Street. Councillor Emmerson said that Strand Street was also a hidden blind spot away from two main roads, and the parking regulations signs had also been spray painted out in the street and wider area, thereby inactivating any regulated enforcement. He stated that he had big transport and parking concerns. Councillor Emmerson said that whilst the report stated that there would be cycle storage at the site, that didn't necessarily mean that they would be used and visitors to the site might have vehicles. He said that the whole permitter of the building, also had double yellow lines and was only a few feet away from a zebra crossing. Councillor Emmerson said that the proposed development would be out character with the area. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with some of what had been said, particularly about the loss of the flats. He said that having lots of houses of multiple occupancy was not sustainable as people tended to not stay in them for long and they could also cause community cohesion problems. However, Councillor Bright said that the proposed development would bring the building back into use and whilst he didn't like the amount of houses of multiple occupancy, in this particular case, because of where it was and that it would be above a shop and not in a residential street, he might support approving the application.

Councillor Hudson said that the Planning Committee often talked about empty spaces above shops, and what was proposed would utilise empty space above a shop. He said that the agent had explained that the reason for the two smaller retail units was that they were easier to let. Councillor Hudson said that there was a need for the housing, and the high-rise flats were knocked down due to expensive cladding, and the vast majority were empty. He stated that there was a demand for housing, and he welcomed the investment. Councillor Hudson said that there were also no complaints from residents about the proposed development and it was only the Ward Councillors who objected to the

application. He said that he would propose that the application be approved if the proposal to refuse the application failed.

Councillor Lindley said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson. He said that the proposed development would help pick the area up. Councillor Lindley said that there had been a big emphasis about traffic, but there were still some retail shops in the area, as well as the Caxtons, the skate park and the school, so it was a well-used area in terms of parking. He said that it was highly unlikely that a nine-bedroom house of multiple occupancy was going to lead to an additional nine vehicles in the area. Councillor Lindley said that he wanted to see the area built back up and there not be boarded up shops. He said that what was proposed was a good proposal and shouldn't be refused.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he agreed with both Councillor Hudson and Councillor Lindley. He said that it was unusual for an application regarding a house of multiple occupancy to have no residents objecting. Councillor Kaczmarek said that when he thought about where he would want houses of multiple occupancy to be in North East Lincolnshire, he couldn't think of better place than where was proposed. He said that the building was not in use and was not located on a dense residential street. Councillor Kaczmarek said that there were a few issues, such as a lack of parking, but that was the same as other areas in the borough. He said that there were bus services and a train station nearby as well as cycle storage for the development. Councillor Kaczmarek stated that he would second any proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt said that houses of multiple occupancy were filling a void for the lack of social housing, and he thought that residents would prefer a house of multiple occupancy that was licenced rather than one allowed under permitted development. Councillor Shutt said that he would support approving the application.

There was no seconder to Councillor Emmerson's proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Kaczmarek seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Humphrey returned to the meeting.

Item 2 - DM/0223/25/FUL – Land North of Wellfits, Main Road, Wold Newton

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Ollard spoke as the applicant for the application. She said that the application had come about after talking to the Wolds Ramblers, as they used the area a lot, as a convenient 10km route. Ms Ollard said that what was proposed was a small community project, and people wouldn't really know about it, unless they used the area. She stated that it was not going to be a huge commercial business opportunity and instead would give the Wolds Ramblers somewhere to get a coffee and change their boots. Ms Ollard said that it would not be staffed, but there would be a camera there. She said that there had been a few objections to the application and there did seem to be a slight "not in my back yard" mentality. Ms Ollard said that Wold Newton was very beautiful, and everyone should be able to enjoy it. She said that she had received a lot of positive comments asking when it would be up and running. Ms Ollard stated that there would be two small benches for people to sit, change their boots and drink their coffee. She said that she was also going to improve all the fencing.

Councillor Hudson said that he was a ward councillor for the area and the application had split the village. He said that the people who had objected, mostly lived in the area and those supporting the application were people who wanted to use the proposed coffee shed and lived either outside of the area or more at the end of the village. Councillor Hudson said that the Church Hall had started selling cakes and coffee two days a month since the pandemic to raise money and that had become very popular, but had made it difficult for people to get past and residents were frightened that it would become very busy similar to the Church Hall and would add to the problems. Councillor Hudson said that it didn't look like it would add to the problems, and he didn't think it would get the same attention the Church Hall got as that was limited to two days a month, whereas this would be there all the time. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Bright said that he thought the proposed application would support existing walkers and give them a place to stop. He said that he didn't think people were going to drive there just to get a coffee. Councillor Bright said that the proposed opening hours were reasonable and whilst he understood the points raised by Councillor Hudson regarding the objections, he saw no reason to object to the application. He stated that he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Lindley said that it was not Costa Coffee being considered, but instead a small community asset. He said that it would serve people in that area and was being set up by somebody from that area. Councillor Lindley said that whilst some of the people who supported the

application were not necessarily from the specific area, that didn't detract from their support. He stated that there were more comments in support of the application than in objection to it. Councillor Lindley said that whether what was proposed would take trade away from the Church Hall was not a material planning consideration. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt said that it was a wonderful idea, and he felt that committee members should support the application. He said that his only concern was that if it were to become successful, would it be developed further, but that would be considered through a separate planning application. Councillor Shutt stated that he would support the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that it was good to see the community getting together and she thought what was proposed would be a great community asset. She said that it was a shame the application had split the village, but she thought it would be great. Councillor Goodwin seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that when he first looked at the application, he had noticed that a lot of people supporting the application were not living in the area and as he did with all planning applications, he tended to want to see how it would impact those living in the area. He said that he lived in a small village, where people did tend to drive into the village to walk their dogs and park all over and having a designated space for people to park, and enjoy the countryside, appealed to him. Councillor Pettigrew said that from that point of view, he thought it would benefit the area. He said that on balance, he would support 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 3 – DM/0838/25/FUL – Agriculture Land South View Humberston

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Jarvis referred committee members to the supplementary agenda which contained additional information. She stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Bright said that the supplementary agenda had covered it all. He said that he didn't think the application should have been brought before the Planning Committee. He said that what was proposed was a

betterment to what had previously been approved. Councillor Bright proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson didn't accept the comments made by Humberston Village Council. He said that the development would be smaller as a result of the changes. Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that what was proposed was an improvement. He said that Humberston Village Council had objected to the scheme as a whole but there was no overlooking as a result of the variation and there was a good separation. Councillor Lindley said that he would be supporting the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt stated that he agreed with what the other Councillors had said. He said that if the variation had been a part of the original application, he didn't think it would have been refused as a result.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he agreed with what had been said.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he agreed with what had been said. He said that he thought Humberston Village Council needed to look at applications with a more open mind.

Councillor Humphrey said that even though Humberston Village Council had every right to object, he thought it might be worth considering an offer of further planning training to parish councils.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Humphrey left the meeting.

Item 4 - DM/0814/25/FULA – 27 Meadowbank, Great Coates

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from a ward councillor, Councillor Downes. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the applicant had lived at the property for thirty years, and the outbuilding would be used as a gym. Mr Snowden said that a pre-application had been submitted and received positive feedback from officers. He said that garden outbuildings were fairly common, especially since the pandemic, and were used for a variety of uses. Mr Snowden said that

garden outbuildings generally enjoyed permitted development rights and could therefore be built without planning permission. He said that in this particular case, his client wanted to locate the outbuilding in part of his garden where permitted development rights had been removed. Mr Snowden said that his client bought the land along with other residents in 2006 and the land had been part of his garden since and was currently used as a patio area. He said that objections had been received from number 24 and number 30 Meadowbank, but their homes were 48 and 32 metres away. Mr Snowden said that there would be screening of the outbuilding from the evergreen hedgerow and the fir trees. He said that there would be no impact to wildlife as a result of the proposed development and the outbuilding would be built on the section that was artificial grass. Mr Snowden said that there were no objections from any council consultees. He asked committee members to approve the application.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Downes, a Ward Councillor for the Freshney Ward.

Councillor Downes wrote that the application related to land that was purchased by residents in Meadowbank, not gifted. She wrote that before it became an integral part of resident's gardens it was a border between Whitgift School field, and at the far end, Great Coates Primary School. Councillor Downes wrote that it was a passage of land with trees, wild plants, grasses and was likely inhabited by wildlife. Over the years, the fragmented strips had been morphed onto the back gardens of several homes, some laid to lawn and used as private gardens. Councillor Downes wrote that whilst they may still attract wildlife, it was no longer the long, wild strip it once was some years ago and the impact of the original clause to prevent building on the land, was an interesting one and was arguably somewhat lessened in importance. She wrote that this was possibly why the village council had not objected. Councillor Downes wrote that the condition does still exist though and so it was right that it be discussed by the Planning Committee. She felt that a clear and consistent approach was needed in the street as to what the land could and could not be used for. Councillor Downes wrote that there did appear to be some sheds already situated on land that was once part of the strip.

Councillor Hudson said that people had bought this land, and it was never going to be kept as a wildlife strip. He said that outbuildings in gardens were common, and the application was only before the Planning Committee because the permitted development rights had been removed. Councillor Hudson said that all the outbuilding was replacing was a piece of astro turf. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Pettigrew had no problem with the recommendation from officers, and he didn't think the project would have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbour's properties. He said that it was a large outbuilding, and he noted that buildings controls were informatives, but he thought it would need building controls particularly due its closeness

to the conifers which he thought would result in a heavy raft or foundation detail. Councillor Pettigrew asked whether a Construction Management Plan was needed to protect neighbours during the construction phase and if a condition regarding the keeping and maintaining of the hedges to ensure residential amenity was protected.

Ms Jarvis responded that she didn't think a Construction Management Plan was needed for a project of this scale but a condition regarding working hours could be included. She stated that in relation to the trees, the council's trees officer was consulted, and he hadn't raised any concerns regarding the outbuilding's proximity to the trees. If he had of felt there would have been an impact, he would have asked for conditions relating to that.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he would be happy for a working hours condition to be added to protect neighbours. He said that he would like to see the trees and hedges kept as a benefit to the project was the screening and he would like to see that robustly protected.

Mr Dixon said that planning officers were not aware of who owned the trees. He stated that the height of the outbuilding was a commonality and planning officers didn't feel that a condition was needed.

Councillor Lindley said that lots of similar developments were allowed under permitted development. He said that 3.8 metres was significant, and he shared Councillor Pettigrew's concern, but it was well isolated and there would be no adverse impact on neighbours. Councillor Lindley stated that he would support the application.

Councillor Bright referred to comments made by the council's trees and woodlands officer and asked if those comments had been addressed as it was not made clear in the officer's report.

Ms Jarvis said that there had been several discussions with the council's trees and woodlands officer and normally within his comments he would provide observations but if he required conditions, he would list them. She stated that there were no formal objections from the council's trees and woodlands officer.

Councillor Bright said that for a 2006 application, there was a reason outlined regarding a condition being needed due to the potential archaeological significance of the land but that had not been included as a condition for this application.

Ms Jarvis responded that the council's heritage officer had been consulted and had reviewed the application and not made any recommendations for conditions. She said that if committee members were concerned, an informative could be added.

Councillor Bright said that whilst he appreciated that the council's heritage officer had looked at the application, someone else had looked

at it in 2006 and thought differently. He stated that he thought there needed to be an informative added.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he wasn't sure why the application had been called in as covenants on land were usually not a matter for the Planning Committee. He stated that he had no issues with the application.

Mr Dixon responded confirming that covenants were separate to the land use planning considerations.

Councillor Shutt said that he understood why Councillor Downes had called the application in as there were concerns by people that covenants were being abused. He said that he thought committee members had considered the issues. Councillor Shutt said that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that he couldn't see any reason to oppose the application.

Councillor Bright stated that the call in by Councillor Downes was perfectly valid.

Councillor Goodwin said that it was quite right that Councillor Downes called in the application and there had been a good discussion by committee members.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application along with the additional working hours condition and for the informative to be included regarding archaeology.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 5– DM/0810/25/FULA – 12 Southfield Road, Grimsby

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that what was proposed was a private dance studio for his client's use only. Mr Deakins said that these types of developments were very common and if they had decided on a flat roof, the proposed development would have been allowed under permitted development. He said that the reason they hadn't used a flat roof, was the height was needed as the dance studio

was to be used for ballet. Mr Deakins said that he didn't think the proposed development would cause any issues as the property had a very large garden and the plot could more than accommodate what was proposed. He said that he had worked with planning officers to amend the design, and the proposed development achieved all what his client wanted with minimal impact to neighbours. Mr Deakins asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Bright said that there were no ecology, amenity or archaeological issues and he was happy to support the application but would listen to the debate.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he agreed with the planning officer's conclusions. He asked whether working hours would be included as part of the Construction Management Plan.

Ms Jarvis responded that working hours were included.

Councillor Lindley said that four objections had been received, and the question committee members needed to ask themselves, was whether the impact of the outbuilding would be detrimental. He stated that he didn't think it would be and there were similar developments in gardens across that area. Councillor Lindley said that given that there was reasonable separation and provided the applicant stuck within the conditions and the outbuilding not be used for commercial purposes, he didn't think the impact would be that great. He said that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Shutt agreed with what other committee members had said. He couldn't see anything within the conditions about the garden room not being used as living accommodation, and it might reassure residents if it was conditioned that it could not be used for that purpose.

Councillor Lindley said that he thought a change of use planning application would be needed to allow for an outbuilding to be used as living accommodation.

Mr Dixon responded that sometimes people did sleep in their outbuildings, and it might be too much to restrict that with a condition. He said that were the applicant to want it to be a separate dwelling house, a separate planning application would have to be submitted for permission to do so.

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

Councillor Hudson said that he had two concerns regarding the application. He said that his first concern was the height of the outbuilding, but that had been explained. He said that his second concern was for number 12a as the applicant was building into their line of view, and it would have been nice to see the outbuilding brought

forward, but it was a strange garden formation. Councillor Hudson stated that he was not going to challenge that.

Councillor Shutt proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Pettigrew 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 Humphrey returned to the meeting.

Item 6 – DM/0721/25/FULA – Woodland View Old Main Road Barnoldby Le Beck

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Bradley spoke in objection to the application. She said that at present the sunlight came directly east and streamed into her kitchen window, but with a double storey extension that would no longer happen so she would be sat in the shade of the extension. Ms Bradley said that a lot had been made about the size of their plot, and that it was not unduly massing due to the size of their plot but her argument was that the applicant could build the extension somewhere else on their plot that wouldn't impact the sunlight. She stated that her view was that the proposed development would cause significant and unnecessary harm to the amenity of her home and this application to her was about whether she could continue to be able to use her patio. Ms Bradley said that a planning officer had suggested that she move her patio, but she asked why she should have to do that as it was the only place there was sunlight. She said that it was not reasonable to say that she should have to do refurbishments and move her patio to somewhere else in her garden. Ms Bradley said that if the application were approved, she wouldn't sit in her patio area, as there wouldn't be the sunlight and would be windows looking down on them as well as a balcony which overlooked the rest of their garden. She showed a photo to the committee members of the deciduous hedge. Ms Bradley said during this time of year, the hedge was completely see through. She stated that it was misleading to say that the hedge offered any screening whatsoever. Ms Bradley said that it was oppressive to take away all of the daylight. She said that her patio would be permanently in the shade and that was a material impact on the residential enjoyment of her home. Ms Bradley said that the applicant could only build within the original size of the three plots, so all the extra land that had been shown in the planning officer's

photos, the applicant was not allowed to build on. She said that he had had to build all the way down the side of her property and therefore the justification that the proposed extension would sit within a huge plot was irrelevant. Ms Bradley said that what was proposed was completely disproportionate to the original three plots that were there, was intrusive and other design options could be explored.

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

Mr Barlas wrote that he'd like to highlight a few key planning points in support of his application following on from the points raised by Barnoldby Parish Council. He wrote that regarding neighbour impact, his immediate neighbour had been invited to visit his side of the property to see how the proposal would sit on the ground and at the time they raised no objections and declined to see the plans prior to submission. Mr Barlas wrote that he had tried to act transparently and in good faith throughout. He wrote that the case officer, Mr Toop, had also visited the site and raised no concerns, and advised that the designs were appropriate for approval. Mr Barlas wrote that regarding the point of privacy and overlooking, the side-facing windows had been designed with obscured glazing and restricted hinges to prevent any intrusive views. He wrote that the Juliet balcony was an existing feature and because the extension projected outward, it actually reduced overlooking compared with the current layout. Mr Barlas wrote that on the point of overshadowing and daylight; the proposal fully complied with daylighting guidelines. He wrote that the nearest flank window on The Oakes was around 12.5 metres away and sat compliant with the 45-degree rule. Mr Barlas wrote that their closest ground-floor window was screened by a 3-metre-high hedge owned by The Oakes, so any shading risk was negligible. He wrote that guidelines recommend that at least half of the garden or open space can receive at least two hours sunlight on March 21. Mr Barlas wrote that the area The Oakes claim would experience some shading represented just over 5% of their total rear garden and patio space and given The Oakes already has a 5-metre-deep two-storey rear extension and a 3-metre-tall hedge, the claim of new overshadowing wasn't supported by the evidence. He wrote that on the point of scale and character; the proposed extension represented a 36% footprint increase which was modest by local standards. Mr Barlas wrote that examples of nearby precedent included the Walkerley House across the road which was approved for a 135% increase, and Rosedale House across the road, which was also approved for a 27% increase, both on smaller plots. He wrote that Woodland View sat about 70 metres back from the main road and was well screened by hedging and a growing woodland, so it wouldn't appear dominant. Mr Barlas wrote that many nearby homes had large extensions, so the proposal remained entirely in keeping with the established character of Barnoldby le Beck. He wrote that on the point of site coverage even after the extension, around 900 square metres of private garden and patio space would remain within the rear of the domestic curtilage, which was about a 12% reduction, showing that the property would still enjoy a generous space and green

setting. Mr Barlas wrote that on the point of drainage the site lied outside any flood-risk area and the increase in roof area could be easily managed with water butts, and the council's drainage team had raised no concerns. He wrote that he had never experienced flooding on his property. Mr Barlas wrote that the field to the north to his property, which was developed later by his neighbour to the north included a new hard surface tennis court sitting on higher ground which may be more relevant to local surface-water flow than this proposal. He wrote that in summary:

- No loss of privacy — all side windows obscure-glazed and restricted.
- No harmful overshadowing — fully compliant with guidance.
- A modest and proportionate footprint increase consistent with local precedent.
- Ample private garden space retained — no overdevelopment.
- The property remained well screened and in keeping with the area.
- No flood-risk concerns raised by the drainage team.
- The planning officer has visited and recommended approval.

Mr Barlas's intention had been to design a home that fitted comfortably within its surroundings, respects his neighbour's privacy, and reflect the character of Barnoldby le Beck. He wrote that he had worked openly, taken professional advice, and incorporated feedback wherever possible to ensure the design was both sensitive and proportionate. Mr Barlas concluded that he hoped committee members would view the proposal in that same spirit as a careful and well-considered improvement to his family home that aligned fully with the village's character and planning guidance.

Councillor Hudson said that even though it was a large house and a large plot, he thought it was going to impact the light of the neighbour. He said that he was inclined to propose that a site visit take place, so committee members could see what the impact would be. Councillor Hudson said that he had no problem with the extension on the right side but on the left side he had concerns.

Councillor Pettigrew said that it was the left side extension that was the issue, and he had no issue with the rest of the proposed development. He said that it was such a large house, and he therefore thought there must be something the architect could do without affecting other residents' amenity. Councillor Pettigrew said that he did think what was proposed would affect other residents' amenity and he was leaning towards supporting refusal of the application.

Councillor Bright asked if the proposed development was compliant in terms of the 45-degree rule.

Mr Dixon said that right to light was not a planning consideration but as stated in the applicant's statement the proposed development was compliant with the 45-degree rule. He said that the proposed development was assessed in terms of impact on neighbours and in terms of massing. Mr Dixon said that the planning officer had met with the neighbour and on

balance of consideration had determined that the impact would not be adverse so as to sustain a refusal of the application.

Councillor Bright asked if the impact of the winter period on the screening was considered.

Mr Dixon responded that it was taken into account, and the screening would still be there but to a lesser extent during the winter period.

Councillor Lindley said that when looking at planning officer's photos, they showed two completely different angles, and he couldn't get a perspective from the two different photos of the degree of separation. He said that he felt he wasn't able to make a decision without seeing the site himself. He stated that he would support a site visit as it was a big decision to make and he wanted to make the right decision.

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

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

Councillor Silvester left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Goodwin said that she didn't think the neighbour should have to move her patio and shouldn't have to miss out on having the sun come through her windows.

Councillor Shutt said that he felt he couldn't get a perspective from the photos, and the benefit of a site visit was that you were able to see the context particularly if the site visit took place in the morning. He stated that he would support the proposal of deferral to allow for a site visit to take place.

Councillor Emmerson said that he fully sympathised with the neighbour and thought there would be a loss of sunlight and loss of privacy for the neighbour. He said that he was also concerned about the pond and hedges as they were going to be between bricks and mortar with no sunlight. Councillor Emmerson said that he agreed with the comments made by the parish council regarding over intensification. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Humphrey said that he was fully in favour of the proposal to defer the application in order to allow for a site visit. He said that what was proposed did seem like quite a large increase and seemed a bit excessive.

Councillor Silvester returned to the meeting. As he had missed part of the debate, he did not take part in the voting.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred for a site visit.

(Note - the committee voted 9 for, 1 against with 1 abstention for the application to be deferred for a site visit.)

P.51 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 16th October 2025 – 12th November 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.52 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.53 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.54 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

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

RESOLVED – That the enforcement issues raised by the committee be investigated further.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 11.48am.