



PLANNING COMMITTEE

7th January 2026 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright, Emmerson, Hudson, Humphrey, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Mickleburgh, Parkinson, Pettigrew, and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Richard Limmer (Development Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Tracy Lovejoy (Locum Lawyer)
- Charlotte Trench (Trainee Solicitor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Freeston (Croft Baker Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Jackson (Waltham Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Shepherd (Scartho Ward Councillor)

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

P.55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received for this meeting.

P.56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Humphrey declared a pecuniary interest in P.58 Item 3 DM/0777/25/FUL as his spouse worked for the agent.

Councillor Bright declared an other registerable interest in P.58 Item 4 DM/1194/23/FUL as he had submitted a written representation in objection to the application.

P.57 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 26th November 2025 be approved as a correct record.

P.58 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Item 1 - 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 explained that the application had been deferred at the last committee meeting in order to allow for a site visit, which had now taken place. Mr Dixon outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement from an objector to the application Ms Bradley.

Ms Bradley thanked the committee for taking the time to visit their property to view first-hand the direct impact that the proposed development would have upon their family home. She wished to strongly dispute the submissions made by the applicant at the previous meeting. Ms Bradley wrote that the application was not simply a modest improvement to the applicant's already significant home. She felt that it represented a serious over-intensification and overdevelopment of the original residential plot. Ms Bradley wrote that the applicant relied heavily upon the argument that the proposal represented a minimal percentage increase in the context of his overall plot, but that was nothing more than misleading and selective framing. She commented that it conveniently overlooked the residential curtailment of the original plot size. Ms Bradley felt that the presentation at the previous planning committee meeting of numerous photos of the additional surrounding land was wholly irrelevant to the residential plot under consideration and it was her understanding that that additional land did not even carry permitted garden use, rather woodland planting only, and it was disingenuous to allude otherwise. She wrote that the extensions must be assessed against the established plot size and area of building curtailment, not against a falsely enlarged area. Ms Bradley wrote that the presentation was designed to make the scheme appear proportionate on paper to justify such a significant percentage increase of the property's overall footprint. She felt that on any fair assessment; this was a wholly excessive development of the original plot and would result in a dwelling of a scale that would simply never have been approved if it had been proposed as a new build on the original curtailed site. Ms Bradley wrote that the scale of this proposed

double-sided extension also raised serious concerns about character and future use. The purpose of a development of this magnitude was specifically intended to create a substantial dwelling capable of multiple occupancy, namely for Mr Barlas's extended family members and their corresponding spouses, to all live collectively in one property. Ms Bradley wrote that this was entirely out of keeping with the established character of this road and the local plan of the surrounding village, which otherwise consisted of single-family homes of a modest scale. She wrote that a house of this scale and magnitude would be so dominant that it was approaching the size of a small hotel or care home and was entirely unreasonable in the context of its neighbourly surroundings. The applicant cited other properties as precedent for large sizes, but these were not comparable and, significantly, the specific houses cited had no immediate neighbours at the time of building, which completely changed the planning balance. She wrote that with this site, it was tightly constrained and flanked on the left side, making neighbour impact the dominant consideration. Ms Bradley noted that the applicant incorrectly cited the distance of the nearest flank window on her house as being "around 12.5 metres away" when in fact, it was approximately 2.5-3 metres away, four times closer than was being misrepresented. She wrote that the applicant also claimed compliance with the 45-degree rule, but she entirely disputed the accuracy of that too. The purpose of the 45-degree rule was to prevent exactly what was happening here: an overbearing and oppressive two-storey structure projecting into an immediate neighbour's light and outlook. Critically, the largest and most intrusive part of the extension had been insensitively placed along their side of the boundary, and this was where the harm was greatest. Ms Bradley noted that they would directly face, and be overlooked by, a two-storey brick wall, resulting in a clear loss of sunlight to their patio, a loss of daylight into their kitchen, and an oppressive sense of enclosure. She wrote that this was not a theoretical impact, it was a real, lived qualitative loss of their amenity that would make them miserable. Ms Bradley wrote that they had saved their entire lives to buy their forever dream family home and had moved to live rurally exactly so that they could avoid the claustrophobia of close and oppressive walls and structures. Ms Bradley wrote that the applicant's persistent reliance that the existence of a Hawthorn hedge somehow mitigated the impact as "negligible" was simply not credible. Hedges were not permanent and could never grow tall enough to cover a two-storey extension and its corresponding roof, and, in any case, it was deciduous. Ms Bradley wrote that a hedge was no substitute for proper separation distances and appropriate massing. She wrote that the planning officer initially expressed shared concerns with them during his visit regarding the scale and over-bearing dominance of the proposal, however, he subsequently offered the justification for approval that the patio could be relocated to another area further down their garden in order to regain access to the easterly morning sunlight. Ms Bradley felt that served only to fully concede that this looming extension would cast our current living area into permanent shade and thereby negatively impact our existing residential amenity. In summary, this was a disproportionate and inconsiderate overdevelopment that caused unacceptable harm through excessive

scale, loss of light, and overbearing impact on neighbouring occupiers. Ms Bradley concluded by asking committee members to refuse the application.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement from the applicant Mr Barlas.

Mr Barlas trusted that the recent site visit had clarified the generous plot size and context better than photos could. He wrote that the main objection was the neighbour's claim that the extension would cast their patio into "permanent shade" and "entirely block" sunlight. Mr Barlas felt that was factually incorrect and technical assessment showed that even on the shortest day of the year, shadow affects the patio for only approximately 1 to 1.5 hours in the early morning, and it moved away from their property as a whole. He wrote that for the vast majority of the year, particularly afternoons and evenings when patios were actually used, there was no impact. The Planning Officer had confirmed that the proposal met all residential amenity guidance and the impact did not justify refusal. He wrote that it was important to view this objection in context and when the property on the opposite side ("Greenlands") applied for a roof alteration, the same neighbour objected on the grounds that their proposal threatened their patio. Mr Barlas wrote that in that objection (dated 29th September 2024), they stated, that "our bi-folding kitchen doors lead out onto our rear patio, where we sit outside to enjoy barbeques, alfresco dining and sunbathing. This was a significant feature and reason for purchasing our property." He wrote that the Committee approved that application and crucially, that objection identified the patio area adjacent to the Greenlands as their primary amenity space. It was therefore inconsistent to now suggest that the patio area next to him was the sole critical space. He wrote that since his extension only casted a temporary morning shadow on this side, the claim of "permanent shade" was overstated when viewed against previous statements. Additionally, committee members would have noticed that the neighbour's flank kitchen window of concern was approximately 12.5 metres away from the extension and given this significant separation distance, the claims that this window would suffer "permanent and significant shade" were unfounded and not factual. He wrote that regarding concerns about the left-hand side, the proposal complied with the 45-degree rule and maintained a 12.5-metre separation to the neighbour's flank window. Mr Barlas wrote that regarding "over-intensification", the proposal would still retain 900 square metres of private garden within the curtilage, and this was far less dense than nearby approvals. A concern had previously been raised about the pond but committee members would have seen during the site visit that the pond was drained and not in use and furthermore, it sat beyond the line of the extension, so sunlight would not be blocked. It had been argued that the hedge was translucent in winter but this was a temporary seasonal characteristic and for the significant portion of the year, the hedge was opaque and offered full screening. Mr Barlas wrote that this seasonal variance should not be used to misrepresent the permanent reality of the site and with time the foliage would thicken and increase in height, increasing the screening further even in winter. He added that they had also "designed out" overlooking

using obscure glazing and restricted hinges. Mr Barlas wrote that privacy was guaranteed by the design of the extension, not the season of the year. Mr Barlas concluded by asking committee members to consider the objective facts regarding the north facing orientation, early morning only shadowing, and generous plot size.

Councillor Hudson said that the double storey extension on the left-hand side would be detrimental to neighbours. He was not really concerned about the other extension, but he wouldn't want the double storey extension if he was a neighbour. Councillor Hudson said that he thought that what was proposed was too much and if the extension was single storey, it might not be as much of an issue. He said that as seen on the site visit, the hedge in the winter might as well not be there as you can see straight through it. Councillor Hudson said that what was proposed would be detrimental to neighbours. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Shutt said that the site visit was very valuable. He said that what was proposed was almost extending the same length of the home from the right-hand side to on the left and that was a lot. Councillor Shutt said that what was frustrating was that there was a lot of land available for the design to be amended and it didn't have to be as proposed. He thought the applicant should look at the application and consider what he would think if there was an application like it next to his property. Councillor Shutt said that he didn't feel he could approve the application as it was.

Councillor Bright sought clarification on whether the argument about the residential plot, the original plot and the applicant acquiring additional land around was a material planning consideration.

Mr Dixon responded that this provided context but was not a strong material planning consideration for the application being considered. He said that the plans were clear on what was residential land and what was land the applicant owned around it. Mr Dixon said that the application needed to be determined on what committee members saw when at the site in relation to impacts on neighbours and the character of the area.

Councillor Bright asked about the dispute regarding the 45-degree rule and which window was used.

Mr Dixon responded that the applicant had showed the 45-degree rule and the planning officer had looked at that, and that seemed correct. He said that it was a guide, was not an exact science and was up to the decision maker to make that assessment.

Councillor Bright said that the boundary hedge was mentioned several times in the officer's report but as seen on the site visit you could see straight through it. He said that he couldn't support the application as what was proposed was too overbearing.

Councillor Pettigrew repeated his concern raised at the previous meeting about the left side extension and agreed with what other committee members had said. Councillor Pettigrew would support the proposal of refusing the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh wasn't in attendance at the previous meeting where the application was first considered but had attended the site visit. He thought there was the opportunity to extend elsewhere without impacting on the neighbour. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal of refusing the application on the grounds of impact on the neighbour's amenity.

Councillor Lindley said that he unfortunately wasn't able to attend the site visit due to work demands. He said that he had driven past the properties, looked on Google Maps and had heard the two statements from the objector and the applicant. Councillor Lindley said that the application was recommended for approval so was a lawful development. He said that it was a large property, but committee members had been to numerous site visits regarding extensions where there were concerns raised about blocking daylight and those applications always seemed to get passed. Councillor Lindley said that this application was similar to those previous applications but was of a larger scale. He said that it was a north facing garden and therefore the sunlight you would get there would be minimal. Councillor Lindley said that he wasn't keen to support the proposal of refusing the application. He said that in terms of consistency, this application was not so different to what had been approved in the past.

Councillor Hudson stated that each application should be judged independently.

Councillor Lindley said that he would not be supporting the proposal to refuse the application but would perhaps like to see the application come back with a modification to satisfy committee members, but as it stood, he thought it was okay as it was.

Ms Lovejoy stated that both Councillor Hudson and Councillor Lindley were right in that the committee had to consider each application on its own merit but, if the facts were similar, consistency was also a material planning consideration.

Councillor Parkinson said that in a rural setting with large houses, you did expect a reasonable large gap between the houses, but the proposed extension destroyed that effect. He was unsure about the concerns regarding light even though he thought there would inevitably be some loss of light. Councillor Parkinson stated that he thought that massing was the main problem and that tipped the balance for him. Councillor Parkinson said that he would support the proposal of refusing the application.

Councillor Humphrey said that he had said at the previous meeting that the proposal seemed excessive. He said that when you look at who had objected to the application, it was the three people who would be affected by the proposal. Councillor Humphrey said that those objectors had cited good reasons for their objections such as over intensification. He said that after seeing the site, he did not agree with the planning officer's conclusion that the proposed extensions were subservient to the host dwelling.

Councillor Emmerson stated that the site visit was very useful. He said that the planning officer's photos made it look like there was a big distance but as shown on the tape measure at the site visit, the extension would be 1.85 metres away from the hedge. Councillor Emmerson said that he would be supporting the proposal of refusing the application.

Mr Dixon sought clarification that the reasons for the proposal of refusing the application, was adverse massing, impact to neighbouring amenity and that the application was contrary to policy 5 of the local plan.

Councillor Hudson and Councillor Mickleburgh confirmed those were the reasons for proposing and seconding that the application be refused.

RESOLVED - That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 10 for 1 against for the application to be refused.)

Item 2 - DM/0468/25/Out – Land Parcel at Waltham Road, Barnoldby Le Beck

Mr Limmer introduced the outline application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to objections from both Waltham and Barnoldby Le Beck parish councils, objections from neighbours and as the proposal represented a departure from the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Limmer stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that whilst the site had a Barnoldby Le Beck postcode, it was adjacent to Waltham. Mr Nelson said that the site was located within a sustainable area and had been promoted as a preferred housing site in the current consultation for the local plan. He commended planning officers on their detailed report. Mr Nelson said that whilst he noted that there had been objections raised from residents and the parish councils, there were no technical objections from statutory consultees. He said that the ethos of the scheme was to round off the village. Mr Nelson said that as part of the proposal, soft landscaping was proposed. He explained that at the front of the site, there was a new crossing point which would provide

connectivity to the village. Mr Nelson stated that a good quality mix development was proposed to drive up the design quality of the area. He said that the site was located within flood zone one and swales and an attenuation pond were proposed. Mr Nelson said that landscaping was proposed at the western boundary to mitigate impact and soften the edge of the development. He said that the parking provision was based on the minimum two off street parking spaces and the Transport Statement confirmed that the existing highway network near to the site would continue to operate at a safe capacity with the addition of the development. He said that the applicant was fully in agreement with the section 106 contributions. Mr Nelson said that the site was outside the current local plan, but due to the shortfall in deliverable housing, the tilted balance was therefore engaged in favour of sustainable development. He said that material weight should also be given to the emerging local plan site allocation. Mr Nelson asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Jackson spoke as a Ward Councillor for the Waltham Ward. He felt the integrity of the local plan needed to be maintained, despite what many saw as unreasonable demands to meet a higher housing delivery target. Councillor Jackson said that the site was not identified for housing in the local plan and the application had only been submitted because of the excessive housing target imposed upon us by central government. He said that there were objections to the application from the parish councils and he fully supported those objections as well as the objections submitted by residents. Councillor Jackson said that the development was proposed to take place on arable land, and whilst there may not be a strategic gap between Waltham and Barnoldby Le Beck, there was still a gap, and the proposed development would eat into that. He stated that if committee members had ever driven on the road between Waltham and Barnoldby Le Beck, it was clear that the area was open countryside. Councillor Jackson said that he disagreed with the outcome of the Transport Statement and as a resident of Barnoldby Le Beck, he regularly used the roads in the area, and they were already congested especially at peak times with standing and queuing traffic off from the mini roundabout on Bradley Road up to Waltham. He said that there were significant challenges to the existing highway infrastructure and that was before other major developments had been built out, which would mean an additional load on the road network. Councillor Jackson said that there was also a number of greenfield sites located in and around Waltham in the current local plan which hadn't yet got planning consent, so there was potential capacity for additional housing sites in the Waltham area. He said that he didn't believe that the existing infrastructure was adequate for the amount of development taking place in Waltham. Councillor Jackson stated that Waltham was losing its character as a village and had, had more than its fair share of development for new housing. He said that the local infrastructure was becoming overloaded. Councillor Jackson said that whilst the proposed site had been put forward for the revised local plan, that did not mean it would end up in the revised local plan. He stated that he would object to

its inclusion as he was sure residents would. He asked committee members to refuse the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was sad to see the character of villages go, but we did have two problems in that we have a growing population and many people on housing waiting lists, and the government had decided to build new homes. He was added that more car ownership had created more pressure, regardless of where the development goes. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was leaning towards supporting the application as the council was going to have to provide the extra housing regardless of whether a site was in the local plan or not. He said that Councillor Jackson had made good points however and he would listen to the debate. Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was important to remember that if we object to house building in certain areas, other areas would need to be put forward for the local plan.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he was unsure about the application. He appreciated the fact that the site was not in the local plan and that both parish councils were against the proposed development, but when you look at where development already was, it did appear to him that the proposed development would be rounding off the village. Councillor Kaczmarek said that he was torn as the proposed development made sense from visual standpoint, but he did appreciate that Waltham had, had a lot of development, but he didn't think a reason to refuse an application could be because there were other upcoming developments in the area. He said that the council was also below its housing targets. Councillor Kaczmarek said that he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Hudson said that it was a tricky application to consider, and if it had come before the Planning Committee prior to the Labour government taking control we would have said no. He said that the reason it was before the Planning Committee was due to the government demanding extra houses. Councillor Hudson said that if you were going to build in Waltham, the proposed site was not a bad spot. He said that the dilemma was whether we support the parish councils and residents and take a chance that the planning inspector won't approve it and award costs, or do we approve it due to the situation we were in and the planning officer's recommendation. Councillor Hudson said that his instinct was to refuse the application, but he was struggling as that might be overturned. He stated that he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Lindley said that this might not be a strategic gap, but it was narrowing the land between Waltham and Barnoldby Le Beck. He said if we kept building and narrowing the gap, the villages would merge into one. Councillor Lindley said that the site was not in the local plan and he hated to be pushed to support applications for sites that were not in the local plan purely because it might go to appeal and be overturned. He said that were any decision to go to appeal, then so be it, but we should judge each application on its own merits. Councillor Lindley said that Waltham was in danger of losing its character. He said that no new

infrastructure from highways had been proposed to support the new developments and the only recent highways improvement was twenty years ago with Peaks Parkway and that was at full capacity. Councillor Lindley said that we could not keep expecting the highways to cope with the extra demand from new developments. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Bright said that whilst the tilted balance was in effect, he was of the understanding that policy 5 part 3 still applied and was a material planning consideration. He said that he was torn as when looking at photos of the site, the development did appear to fill a gap. Councillor Bright said that he was leaning towards supporting the proposal of refusing the application as the development would bring the villages closer together and he agreed with Councillor Lindley about where we draw the line of doing so. He said that he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Shutt said that he had a friend who lived in the area who had received a letter about a new pedestrian footpath being put in, so it seemed almost like preparations were underway for the development. Councillor Shutt said that he didn't think it was four-bedroom, five-bedroom houses that were needed. He queried where the smaller houses were. Councillor Shutt said that the site was not in the local plan, and if ended up being part of the local plan, the Planning Committee could look at that then. He stated that he would be supporting the proposal of refusing the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that the idea of the new footpath that Councillor Shutt had referred to was to join it up with existing footpath 72 as there had already been issues with parking at the new school, and the new footpath was certainly not for the proposed development. He said that it was frustrating as an unrealistic housing target had been imposed upon us but time and effort had been put into the local plan. Councillor Pettigrew said that the application did tick all the boxes, but the development was in the wrong place. He said that Waltham was struggling in terms of infrastructure, Brigsley Road was crumbling, and would get worse with further development. He said that there was also congestion in the centre of the village and that had been terrible since a lot of the development had started. Councillor Pettigrew said that there was no parking, businesses were suffering and people didn't want to travel around the village during peak times. He said that you think of a situation like that in relation to a town, not a village. Councillor Pettigrew stated that road safety was a concern for him. He said that the application was a deviation from the local plan, and whilst he understood housing needs, this was the wrong place for the development. Councillor Pettigrew seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that when we consider applications, we do take into account the concerns of the local community, and in this case, it was two separate communities. He said that there did seem to be a lot of development taking place in our villages, and asked when enough was enough. Councillor Emmerson said that there was nothing diverse or

unique about the proposed scheme and he would have been more sympathetic if the development included dwellings for over 55's or for sole accommodation.

Mr Dixon said that planning decisions had to be based on up to date planning policy which was set by the government. He explained that planning was a top down process and government policy was very important and councils had to implement that policy. Mr Dixon said that in terms of need, there was a housing need. He said that the tilted balance did come into effect if a council could not demonstrate that it had a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. Mr Dixon said that committee members had to consider all the issues, such as impact on character of the area and impact to neighbours but could not just refuse the application as it was not allocated in the local plan.

Councillor Humphrey said that the application was for forty-two dwellings, whereas other developments were sometimes for hundreds of dwellings. He said that Waltham was growing as it was a desirable area. He said that the site for the development was the next logical place to develop and in certain circumstances what was proposed was better than what could have been. Councillor Humphrey said that the development was not too large, was not in a ridiculous location and whilst he took on board the concerns raised, he didn't think the Planning Committee could say the development would adversely impact the infrastructure.

The Chair asked Councillor Lindley and Councillor Pettigrew to outline their reasons for proposing and seconding that the application be refused.

Councillor Lindley said that it was due to the over intensification of Waltham, the narrowing of the gap between Waltham and Barnoldby Le Beck and highways and road safety concerns. He said that forty-two dwellings were still significant.

Councillor Pettigrew said that the site was also on an edge and the development would be isolated and out of character with the area. He said that the proposed development would harm the character of Waltham and it was disjointed that the site was deemed as Barnoldby Le Beck. Councillor Pettigrew said that forty-two dwellings were significant and it was important to remember that it was an outline application so the number of dwellings could increase.

Councillor Shutt said that there was an application being considered at this meeting for a house of multiple occupancy and we were seeing that people were renting out single rooms as they were struggling to afford to live in flats and houses. He said that this application didn't do anything to help with our social affordable housing.

Mr Dixon responded that this was an outline application and the committee couldn't object to the application on those grounds as that

detail on houses hadn't been determined. He said that based on what had been said, the reasons for the proposal to refuse the application was the visual impact and that it would be adverse to the character of the area. He stated that he did not think there was a case to refuse the application based on highways grounds.

Councillor Lindley responded that he thought there was a unanimous view, that the highways infrastructure was not sufficient for all the developments seen in that area. He said that highways was a very important issue and we were going to end up in a situation where we were gridlocked.

Councillor Bright said that policy 5 part 3 of the local plan was still a material planning consideration and protection of the distinctive open character, protection of landscaping quality and protection of the role the site played in the setting of Waltham and Barnoldby Le Beck was for him the three main reasons for supporting the proposal to refuse the application. He said that he didn't think a Transport Assessment had been undertaken.

Ms Hattle responded that there was a Transport Statement and it outlined that the impact of the proposed development on the highway network would be minimal. She said that the Planning Committee would struggle to fight an appeal on highways grounds.

Councillor Hudson stated that highways should not be included as a reason to refuse the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Councillor Humphrey left the meeting at this point.

Item 3 – DM/0777/25/FUL – 24 -26 Yarra Road, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received and a call in from Councillor Freeston. 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 property was currently a guest house, for short term accommodation. Mr Deakins said that houses of multiple occupancy were similar in that people didn't tend to live in them for the long term, so in terms of the comings and goings, it would be broadly similar. He said that he did tend to see with applications for houses of multiple occupancy, comments that people who lived in them were anti-social and noisy. Mr Deakins said that he didn't understand where that assumption came from. He said that

the applicant wanted to rent the rooms out on the open market and were not earmarked for any particular group. Mr Deakins said that he did understand the anxiety that came with change, but he was confident the house of multiple occupancy would fit in. He stated that the house of multiple occupancy did meet the housing officer's standards and there would also be bin storage and cycle storage. Mr Deakins said that the house of multiple occupancy would be subject to a licence, and houses of multiple occupancy were some of the most heavily regulated types of accommodation. He said that there was a good level of control, and in the event of a problem, one call to the housing officer and they would be straight onto the landlord. Mr Deakins said that the property was located in a sustainable location, near to bus routes and near to the amenities of Cleethorpes. He said that when the rooms were rented out, estate agents made it clear, whether there was parking or not. Mr Deakins stated that the application proposed very few external changes to the property. He said that some doors and windows would be removed and there would also be some refurbishment to the outside, particularly the front area. Mr Deakins said that the colours used would match those used on Alexandra Road. He reiterated that the property was previously used as a guest house for ten people, plus staff so the numbers using the property moving forward would be broadly similar.

Councillor Freeston spoke as a Ward Councillor for the Croft Baker Ward. He said that one of the reasons he was objecting to the application was due to over intensification. Councillor Freeston said that the road had thirty-five houses and this application proposed to increase that by fourteen residents. He said that he disagreed with the agent who had said there was not much difference between guest houses and houses of multiple occupancy. Councillor Freeston said that people were in guest houses for days, but people lived in houses of multiple occupancy for months or years. Councillor Freeston stated that it was also an increase from ten people in the property to fourteen and guest houses were not always at full capacity, particularly during the winter season. He said that the residents were against this, and although planning officers had recommended approval, Planning Committee members were the decision makers and residents across the borough had objected to the application as they had concerns. Councillor Freeston said that there was also a primary school nearby and asked committee members if they would have concerns about a house of multiple occupancy being developed nearby to a school their child attended. He said that whilst he didn't want to assume that illegal immigrants would be housed here, that was a real concern for the community. Councillor Freeston said that people can say things like why do houses of multiple occupancies get bad reputations, but it was quite clear why they do as, for example, you did get people being released from prison into them. Councillor Freeston said that he was once going to live in a house of multiple occupancy and fully understood the struggle of trying to afford a house, so he was not bashing people who lived in houses of multiple occupancy, but you could get people living in them who may not be the best kind of neighbours. He stated that there was no guarantee that the people living in this house of multiple occupancy

would not be undesirable for the area. Councillor Freeston said that people could say his justifications for objecting to the application weren't valid and we should welcome everyone, but people were genuinely fearful. He said that we must object to the application due to its effect on local character. Councillor Freeston said that what was proposed was a near forty percent increase in residents. He said that he was not against houses of multiple occupancy full stop, but this one was a bad idea.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that people weren't coming into Cleethorpes to stay overnight like they used to. He said that if the alternative was for the guest house to close, and the building left, that could cause problems whereas the proposed development would bring the property into use and save it from that scenario. Councillor Mickleburgh said houses of multiple occupancy were needed as property prices and rent for flats and houses had gone up. He said that people did also come over to Cleethorpes for seasonal work, so this house of multiple occupancy would be good for them to stay in. Councillor Mickleburgh said that people who live in houses of multiple occupancy were not people who tended to have cars. He said that he accepted the argument about people coming from prison and living in houses of multiple occupancy, but they may also want to change their lives and were not necessarily going to cause trouble. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he didn't know where the idea had come from that people should be fearful of those living in a house of multiple occupancy, and there did seem to be climate of hate being developed by some people in the country that was causing people to feel fearful when that didn't need to be the case. He said that no one ever knew what their neighbours were going to be like, no matter where they live. Councillor Mickleburgh said that you had to be careful not to demonise people and there was a need for houses of multiple occupancy. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that he had supported the approval of a house of multiple occupancy on Cleethorpe Road, but that was for reasons of bringing the building back into use and that it was not located in a residential area. He said that this application for a house of multiple occupancy was completely different. Councillor Bright said that he disagreed with the agent that the comings and goings of a house of multiple occupancy were similar to that of a guest house. He said that they would be significantly different, as the occupancy rates of guest houses was about thirty to forty percent and the idea of a house of multiple occupancy was to fill all the rooms. Councillor Bright said that the proposal would mean sixteen individuals living in two properties, and he thought that was complete over intensification and failed local plan policies 5 and 22. He said that there were also lots of cars in the street and there would be issues with parking in the area. Councillor Bright said that houses of multiple occupancy were very transient in nature, the occupants passing through had no stake in the local community, and that was the character of the business. He said that would change the local community, which was quite tight knit. Councillor Bright said that there was also limited outdoor space in the back and that space would be for sixteen people. Councillor Bright stated that policy 12 of the local plan

outlined safeguarding tourist economy and this application didn't do that. He said that sustainable travel was mentioned in the officer's report, but that was theoretical. Councillor Bright said that the letter from the applicant outlined that the proposed house of multiple occupancy was for professional people, but if that was the case, then he would think some of them would have a car. Councillor Bright said that the rooms were only just meeting the minimum size requirements. He said that the house of multiple occupancy could also have more people in it, such as visitors and friends of the residents. Councillor Bright stated that this was the wrong place for this proposal.

Councillor Lindley said that there was a need for houses of multiple occupancy, but the key was having them in the right place. He said that he thought this one was fine. He said that residents of house of multiple occupancy did get bad press, similar to children's homes and sometimes it was a 'not in my backyard' scenario. Councillor Lindley said that what was proposed would bring the building back up to date. He agreed with Councillor Mickleburgh that whipping up hysteria made people fearful, and he didn't think it was fair to label residents of houses of multiple occupancy as people who would cause anti-social behaviour. He said that Councillor Freeston had referred to there being a school nearby, but there was separation and the school was secure. Councillor Lindley stated that he didn't think any of the children attending that school would be in any danger and to suggest so would be wrong. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he preferred houses of multiple occupancy to be for a smaller number of rooms. He asked how the house of multiple occupancy would be managed.

Mr Dixon responded that the house of multiple occupancy would have a licence.

Councillor Parkinson asked about building regulations for the house of multiple occupancy particularly regarding sound insulation.

Mr Dixon said that the house of multiple occupancy was subject to building regulations.

Councillor Parkinson said that the house of multiple occupancy was for a lot of people in a compacted street. He stated that he was unsure about the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he disagreed with Councillor Parkinson as there were problems in his ward with houses of multiple occupancy allowed under permitted development. He said that not dealing with housing needs years ago, had created the problem we were now in. Councillor Shutt said that there was more control and accountability with licenced houses of multiple occupancy. He said that the points raised by Councillor Freeston were concerning and for a lot of residents, it was the unknown factor. He said that guest houses and BnB's were not as

popular, and we had to adapt to that. Councillor Shutt said that a lot of the concerns raised by Councillor Freeston and residents were not material planning considerations. He said that at the moment licenced houses of multiple occupancy were better than permitted development ones and he would therefore support the application as there was a need, but we did need to look at why there was a need and change what we do to make that need go away.

Councillor Hudson said that no one knew who was going to live in the house of multiple occupancy but to say no to an application based on a chance that there will be problems with the tenants was not what the Planning Committee was there to do. He said that the fact that the house of multiple occupancy would be licenced should help people with their concerns. Councillor Hudson said that we had to rely on the council and the police to make sure there were no issues.

Councillor Emmerson said that the property was on a terraced street, near residential properties. He asked who was going to maintain the garden space. Councillor Emmerson said that he had concerns about traffic, and whilst cycle storage had been included in the scheme, that did not mean it was going to be used. Councillor Emmerson said that young professionals were more likely to have a car. He queried whether the building complied with fire regulations, regarding escape routes and rear exits. Councillor Emmerson said that applicant had said the house of multiple occupancy was for more short-term accommodation, but what about community cohesion if there was lots of comings and goings. He said that Councillor Freeston had said he had spoken to his residents who were worried, so there was that evidence.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 7 for, 2 against with 1 abstention for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Councillor Humphrey returned to the meeting at this point.

Councillor Bright left the meeting at this point.

Item 4 - DM/1194/23/FUL – Plot 192, Humberston Fitties, (Rear of 193) Humberston

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 Robinson spoke as the agent for the application. She said that they had worked with planning officers and all reports had been done and the legal requirements met. Ms Robinson said that they had also worked

with the conservation officer to make sure the design was acceptable. She stated that they had agreed to the new occupancy times to make sure that the Environment Agency felt appeased. Ms Robinson said that there were eight objections received initially but there had been a few more since. However, she said that they had received some positive comments. Ms Robinson said that her client lived on the neighbouring site, so it was not in their interest to do anything detrimental to the plot. She said that they want to build a chalet so people could use it for holiday purposes. Ms Robinson said that her client didn't want to go down the route of caravans and believed that Humberston Fitties was a special place.

Councillor Pettigrew said that all applications for the Humberston Fitties site were always carefully considered. He said that what was proposed was a modest chalet which he thought would fit in. Councillor Pettigrew said that he saw no reason to oppose the application but would listen to the debate.

Councillor Parkinson said that this application didn't raise any of the issues sometimes discussed during consideration of other applications for Humberston Fitties. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that the proposed chalet was pleasing to the eye, and met all the requirements, including the sequential test. He stated that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that Humberston Village Council had not objected to the application, and he saw no reason to refuse the application. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that he was more torn about the application. He asked whether planning condition three was a common occurrence on Humberston Fitties.

Mr Dixon responded that, that condition was a condition for a number of chalets recently granted planning permission either for replacements or new ones. He said they were holiday chalets, not dwellings and it was to do with the defence. Mr Dixon said that the ten year permission was imposed for those sites east of St Anthony's Bank which was part of the Environment Agency National Defence.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Bright returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 5 – DM/0817/25/FUL – Icing Cabin, 15 Waltham Road, Grimsby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from Councillor Shepherd. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Limmer said that it had been determined that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the building or the Scartho Conservation Area and would cause detrimental harm through the use of inappropriate materials. He stated that the application was recommended for refusal.

Councillor Shepherd spoke as a Ward Councillor for the Scartho Ward. Councillor Shepherd said that Swales shop windows had been in place since the 1960s and had been carefully maintained, but over time the wood construction had rotted in places, causing the owner's concern and a wish to change the window. Councillor Shepherd said that an application to replace the unit with a UPVC window was refused on the grounds that the building fell within the Scartho Conservation area. He said that this was quite bemusing considering adjacent properties had had replacement UPVC units. Councillor Shepherd said that the applicant then decided to resubmit a proposal to replace the unit with an anodised aluminium finish. He said that the adjacent shop had windows replaced in 2019 in similar materials but with no planning permission and no subsequent enforcement, these were black anodised aluminium. Councillor Shepherd referred to photos he had provided of other shop fronts in the conservation area. He said that as could be seen from the evidence, there were clearly differing opinions and standards on what was or was not acceptable for material consideration within the conservation area. Councillor Shepherd said that in 2025 a business on Waltham Road was forced to relocate due to permission not been given to alter their shop frontage. He said that they submitted a planning application which was approved for the refurbishment of a unit on Louth Road, some 78 metres away from the bakers and within the conservation area. Councillor Shepherd asked why we were allowing consent for one type of material and refusing other types that had previously been approved. He asked that the Planning Committee to approve the application on the grounds of consistency. He stated that anodised aluminium would last for the next sixty years, if replaced with wood we would be back here again in six years' time.

Councillor Lindley said that there wasn't much more to add to what Councillor Shepherd had said. He said that the circulated picture of Swales didn't do it justice in terms of how damaged the wood was. Councillor Lindley said that he thought it was worse for the conservation area to leave the windows as they were. He said that it wouldn't make any sense to refuse the application. Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Pettigrew said that it was important to recognise conservation areas and the council's heritage officer was right to raise the concerns they had. He said that the shop front as it was, was not enhancing the conservation area and aluminium did look smart. Councillor Pettigrew said that whilst he thought the process was right, in that the council's

heritage officer had raised concerns, he didn't agree with the recommendation. He said that aluminium would have no detrimental impact on the conservation area. Councillor Pettigrew seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that sometimes we were too precious about conservation areas. He said that nothing looks worse on a shop front than decaying wood. Councillor Mickleburgh stated that other shops had been able to alter their shop fronts, and he agreed with Councillor Shepherd about the inconsistency. He said that what was proposed would fit in and no further works would be needed to be done for a long time.

Councillor Emmerson said that there was a full row of commercial properties from Scartho Fork all the way down to Springfield Road, all in a commercial character, bright lighting and some premises had UPVC windows and doors. He said that he felt that the council's heritage officer was picking a fight with a small business who wanted to enhance their building and local area. Councillor Emmerson said that he would support the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright said that if some businesses hadn't got planning permission, then perhaps enforcement officers needed to look at that. He said that the conservation area was there for a reason and he tended to listen to the conservation officer on these matters. Councillor Bright said that he didn't think just because others had not got planning permission, that we should just continue approving other applications.

Councillor Parkinson said that he thought it was too late and we had to go with uniformity now. He said that aluminium was better than UPVC.

Councillor Humphrey said that when you read the report, the application appeared clear, but when you looked at the reality and Councillor Shepherd's photos, the photos made it clear what had happened. He said that the council's heritage officer should have been more detailed. Councillor Humphrey said that the fact that the applicant was trying to improve the building was a good thing, and whilst he agreed two wrongs didn't make a right, others had not been enforced against. He said that he couldn't see how we could refuse the application unless we were being consistent elsewhere in the area. Councillor Humphrey said that more information was needed in the officer's report.

Councillor Shutt said that the council's conservation officer was doing their job, Councillor Shepherd was doing his, and the Planning Committee was doing theirs and that was democracy at work.

Councillor Hudson said that it was a very interesting message to send to residents, that enforcement action was not taken on those who hadn't got planning permission and then when someone tries to do it properly, officers were going to refuse the application.

Mr Dixon sought clarification that the reason for the proposal to approve the application was that they felt that the proposal would preserve the conservation area and would not have a detrimental effect on it.

Councillor Lindley and Councillor Pettigrew confirmed that was the reason.

Councillor Shutt said that it was not the first shop to change its shop frontage.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he had looked at the application individually and didn't think aluminium would have a detrimental impact. He said that he didn't think consistency needed adding as a reason for approving the application.

Mr Limmer outlined the conditions including a condition about colour.

Councillor Lindley asked if there were any restrictions regarding colour.

Councillor Shutt said that he thought that a decision on colour should be delegated to officers.

Councillor Pettigrew thought the colour should be white so it would be like for like.

Councillor Shutt reiterated that he thought the decision should be with planning officers.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Parkinson left the meeting at this point.

P.59 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 13th November 2025 – 18th December 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.60 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.61 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.62 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 12.30pm.