



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 28th September 2023

PLANNING COMMITTEE

14th June 2023 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Pettigrew (in the Chair)

Councillors Batson, Brasted (substitute for Parkinson), Croft, Dawkins (substitute for Lindley), Hasthorpe, Holland, Hudson, Mickleburgh (substitute for Goodwin) and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

- Keith Thompson (Solicitor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Richard Limmer (Development Manager)
- Matthew Chaplin (Public Rights of Way Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Harness (Humberston and New Waltham Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Sandford (Yarborough Ward Councillor)

There were 42 members of the public present and one member of the press.

P.1 APPPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

It was noted that at the Annual General Meeting of the Council held on 25th May, 2023, Councillor Pettigrew had been appointed Chairman and Councillor Hasthorpe had been appointed Deputy Chairman of this Committee for the Municipal Year 2023/2024.

P.2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received for this meeting from Councillors Aisthorpe, Goodwin, Lindley and Parkinson.

P.3**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Hasthorpe declared an other registrable interest in P.4 as he is the Chair of the Laceby Parish Council.

Councillor Holland declared an other registerable interest in P.5 Item 7 as he called in the application.

Councillor Pettigrew declared a non-registrable interest in P.5 Item 8 as his daughter works for the applicant.

P.4**APPLICATION TO ADD A PUBLIC FOOTPATH FROM BUTT LANE TO PUBLIC FOOTPATH 110, LACEBY.**

The panel received a report from the Executive Director for Place and Resources seeking to add a Public Footpath from Butt Lane to Public Footpath 110, Laceby. Mr Chaplin said that there was evidence to suggest that the section of claimed path between A and B on the plan had been used by the public on foot 'as of right', without interruption or challenge for a period more than 20 years prior to March 2017 when the rights of the public were called into question and was therefore deemed to subsist. Mr Chaplin said that the application was supported by twenty-three user evidence forms submitted in 2018. Mr Chaplin said that there had been two objections received. Mr Chaplin stated it was recommended that the footpath order be approved.

Mrs Jagger spoke in objection to the application for the footpath. She said that the specific area was filled with toxic waste and said that Laceby Parish Council were aware of this. Mrs Jagger said that there was a risk of noise, risk of fire and there was no access for emergency vehicles. Mrs Jagger said that there would also need to be regular gas checks. She said that the land was originally for the allotments and was then left and then the Parish Council authorised a nature area. Mrs Jagger said that since dealing with the issue regarding the footpath, she has received harassment letters and said that this had recently started again. She said that she had also been cyber bullied due to the issue by the parish council. Mrs Jagger said that her neighbour had not been able to enjoy his last years due to the issue of the footpath. Mrs Jagger stated that she had lived at her property for forty years and said that the gate had always been locked. She felt that there were already enough areas for dog walkers. Mrs Jagger stated that she had submitted evidence of the issues she had raised.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was concerned to hear about the issues with the parish council. He said that he was not sure the issues raised were planning considerations. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he believed the photographs showed that there was evidence of a footpath. He commented that he would have liked to have seen more recent photographs. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he was a Laceby Parish Councillor but was speaking as a member of the Planning Committee. He said that he could not speak to actions of previous councillors and could only speak for himself and the time that he had been a councillor. Councillor Hasthorpe said that he had not had any dealings with the residents in the specific area. He said that he had heard arguments for and against the footpath. Councillor Hasthorpe said that he had lived in Laceby for a long time including between the years of 1961 – 1987 and said that he used to play on land near Butt Lane and it was known as Isaacs Farm. He said that it was a piece of wasteland and there had always been a path there. Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson said that there wasn't currently a footpath which was why it was being considered. He said that the committee normally considered applications for reasonable diversions which he was usually keen to support. Councillor Hudson said that the current application was the opposite to that and instead was asking that we put a footpath between two houses. Councillor Hudson said that he had sympathy for the residents. He said that the only reason the application was before us was because twenty-three people had used it. He said that he was torn and would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Shutt said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson. He said he had sympathy for Mrs Jagger. Councillor Shutt said that it was difficult to fight human nature and said that he thought people would use the footpath. He said that he was minded to support the application but would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Holland said that he thought the main issue was whether the statements that the footpath had been used for twenty years were true. He said that he was unsure how many would use the footpath in future. Councillor Holland said that on balance he would support the application.

RESOLVED –

1. That an Order be made under Section 53(2)(b) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a Public Footpath in Laceby.
2. That the Order be confirmed by North East Lincolnshire Council as an unopposed Order if no objections or representations were received to the Order within the statutory timescales, or, if objections or representations to the Order were received that they be submitted to the Secretary of State with a request that the Order be confirmed.

(Note – the committee voted 9 for and 1 against to approve the application.)

**Item 1 - DM/0369/23 FUL – Thorpe Park Holiday Camp,
Anthony's Bank Road, Humberston**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought a variation of condition 2 (approved plans) pursuant to DM/1038/21/FUL for revision to allow for alterations to footprint, external terraces and service yard, remove and relocate the roof lights, alterations to openings on the south and west elevations, amendments to escape staircase to include replacement escape ramp. Mr Dixon clarified that within the report it had said that canopies were to be removed, he said that this was included in error and that there were no canopies included in the scheme to remove. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council and due to the number of objections received. Mr Dixon said that the changes proposed were considered to be minor and would result in an overall lesser scheme than what was originally agreed. He said that the principle of the development had been established by the extant permission. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed changes would not have a negative impact on the character of the area and would not have an adverse impact on the Humberston Fitties Conservation Area. Mr Dixon stated that there had been objections raised regarding the application. He said that the proposed changes would not add any additional impacts to the neighbouring amenity. Mr Dixon said that the proposed changes would result in a reduction in glazing. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 12, 22, 39 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Peet spoke in objection to the application. He said that Thorpe Park had failed to go through the planning process correctly. Mr Peet said that work had been undertaken on the site and said that the application should be considered a retrospective application. Mr Peet said that the planning officers report did not state that the applicant had previously not adhered to planning conditions. Mr Peet said that nobody should have to hear the level of noise that was coming from the site when in their own property or garden. Mr Peet stated that the plans failed to deliver the requirements outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework. Mr Peet said that Thorpe Park continued to disregard the planning process and said that Thorpe Park had had no regard for anyone outside of their boundaries.

Mr Cox spoke as the agent for the application. He said that planning permission for the Showbar was given last year. Mr Cox said that work had subsequently started on the site and the current application was asking for minor changes to what had been previously agreed. He stated that the proposed changes would not materially affect the overall approved plans. Mr Cox said that whilst he noted the objections raised, the site was located within the designated area for tourism and leisure activities. He commented that the principle of the development had

already been established. Regarding noise, he felt that the amendments being proposed should be welcomed. Mr Cox said that there had been no objection raised from the council's Environmental Health Officer. Mr Cox said that the proposed scheme was in line with council policy and no technical objections had been raised.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that Thorpe Park needed to consult more with the residents of the Humberston Fitties before going ahead with applications. He said that Thorpe Park had broken planning conditions before, which was an enforcement matter. Councillor Mickleburgh said that if the application was for a new scheme, he would likely be against it, however, officers were stating that the application was for minor changes. Councillor Mickleburgh said he would like reassurance from officers that the changes proposed would not impact residents.

Mr Dixon stated that the changes would lead to a reduction in glazing and said that what was being proposed was considered to be a lesser scheme than what was previously agreed. Mr Dixon said that there had been a breach, but the issue was now to determine the application on its merits, having regard to planning considerations. Mr Dixon said that the roof lights had also been removed from the scheme.

Councillor Hudson said that the proposed changes would be a reduction to the previously agreed scheme which would mean less noise. Councillor Hudson said that he could not understand why people were objecting to a reduction in the scheme. He proposed that the application be approved. Councillor Hudson queried why Councillor Mickleburgh had sought clarification that the changes would lead to a reduction when officers had stated that in their report.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he had sought clarification on the matter to make it clear. He said that he had also wanted to clarify the issue of planning enforcement as it was important that members knew what they could and could not focus on when deciding on an application. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that the proposed changes would mean the development would be smaller, there would be less glass and it would be better for the environment. He said that he supported the residents of the Humberston Fitties but said that he was struggling to support them regarding their objection to the application. Councillor Dawkins said that Thorpe Park had been a part of Cleethorpes for a long time and was currently developing. He said that some of the things they had done recently had been good for tourism.

Councillor Shutt stated that he would like to see agents work with objectors to potentially find compromise and solution. He said that he would support the application.

Councillor Holland queried whether work had commenced prior to planning permission being granted and asked what the noise impact would be.

Mr Dixon stated that noise was a consideration for the committee but said that it had been deemed that the noise would not have an adverse impact on amenity. He stated that Thorpe Park did have planning permission, so work had already taken place, but they now wanted to make changes to the agreed plans. Mr Dixon stated that it was a retrospective application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 13 - DM/0301/23/FUL – 7 Great Coates Road, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought a partial change of use to a mixed use from residential land to include commercial motorcycle garage with erection of a detached coach house, drive with a parking area and associated works. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the committee due to a call in from the ward councillors. Mr Dixon said that the applicant already ran a business and wanted to move the business to the proposed site. Mr Dixon said that the main issue was the principle of the development. He said that the nature of the use was not considered compatible with the proposed site as it was a residential plot. Mr Dixon said that MOT testing centres were typically classified as B2 general industry uses which further suggested the incompatibility with having one in a residential garden. Mr Dixon said that the other issue was that there were alternative sites close by which would be considered to be more appropriate. Mr Dixon said that the proposed building would fit within the plot. Mr Dixon said that the visual impact of the development would be acceptable. Mr Dixon stated that there had been no objections to the application from neighbours and a number of letters of support had been submitted. Mr Dixon said that regarding potential noise, the applicant had agreed to install acoustic panelling. Mr Dixon said that the council's environmental health officer had raised no objections to the application as long as there were strict measures in place regarding working hours and external working. Mr Dixon said that the council's tree officer had initially raised concerns regarding the application, but he said that the tree officer was now content with the plans following amendments being made. Mr Dixon stated that the council's highways officer had objected to the application on the grounds of over intensification of the access. Mr Dixon said that there had been historic issues around contamination in the area and, as such, a condition was included in the application. Mr Dixon stated that the issue around the principle of the development remained as well as the objection from the council's highways officer. Mr Dixon stated that the application was not in accordance with policy 5 of

the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Gunster spoke as the applicant. He said that there had been a fuel leakage on the land and his property had therefore stood empty for fifteen years. Mr Gunster had bought the property in order to bring it back to its former glory. He said that he owned a business but said that the lease would end in 2024. Mr Gunster said that he would be required to re-sign the lease for up to five years which was not needed. Mr Gunster said that he loved his job and continued his trade working from home during the pandemic with no issues or complaints being raised. Mr Gunster said that there was a cost to operating from his current unit and it was not financially viable. Mr Gunster said that he wanted to build a small outbuilding. He said that the main issues had been the motorcycles and the use of the word commercial. Mr Gunster said that if he ran a hairdressers then the application would be allowed, but he said that would also be a commercial enterprise so he was confused. He said that the highways department had raised the issues of footfall and deliveries being made to the business. Mr Gunster said that he had provided them with a statement which had been accepted by the council's highways officer. Mr Gunster stated that he had invited planning officers to come and see that MOT testing was not a loud activity. He further stated that it was not emission testing and the noisiest thing was the compressor but this would only be used now and again. Mr Gunster said that all customers would have to have an appointment before visiting. Mr Gunster said that planning officers had mentioned in their report that there were nearby sites which he could utilise for his business, but surely these sites would cause the same issues. Mr Gunster stated that he would be happy to accept conditions. He asked the committee to approve his application.

Councillor Sandford spoke as a ward councillor for the Yarborough Ward. He said that he was in favour of the application. Councillor Sandford explained that he had visited the site and had a look. He commented that Mr Gunster had received support from his neighbours for the application to go ahead. He said that the business would not cause an impact on the traffic on Great Coates Road and the noise would be minimal. Councillor Sandford was aware that there was fuel which had leaked onto the site several years ago but this issue had been resolved. Councillor Sandford strongly recommended that the committee visit the property to have a look rather than refuse the application without a site visit taking place.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he was in agreement with the highways officers. He said that it was not the right location for the business. Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Croft said that her main concern was the busy road and the excess noise. She said that she would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that the specific area was not purely residential, for example the Humber Royal Hotel was close by. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he thought the development was not going to make much noise. He said that he thought it might be useful to impose conditions regarding noise and amount of use to alleviate any concern. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson stated that he agreed with Councillor Mickleburgh. He said that the applicant had consulted the neighbours and they were happy with the development. Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor Batson said that he didn't think the development would create much noise. He said that it was MOTs for motorcycles, not lorries. Councillor Batson said that he would be supporting the application.

Ms Hattle stated there were highway safety concerns with the proposed commercial development. She said that the proposed use of reopening an access closest to the roundabout that had not been used for over 20 years was of concern. Ms Hattle said that the intensification of this previous residential access would not be supported given how busy Great Coates Road was at this location.

Councillor Dawkins said that tuning was mentioned in the report which could be noisy. He said that he was in two minds regarding the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he was minded to support the application. He said that he was happy to hear that the applicant had consulted his neighbours. He said that he took on board the comments made by the highways officer, but he said that he could not see the seriousness. Councillor Shutt did not want the business to disappear. He thought he would support the application.

Councillor Holland didn't think there would be much impact on the traffic caused by the development. He said that the main issue was noise. Councillor Holland said that the applicant had agreed to install acoustic panelling. He said that should be added as a condition.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he was concerned about the left turn.

Mr Dixon informed committee members that use was granted to the land not the person.

Councillor Hudson asked whether the use could be granted to the person rather than the land.

Mr Dixon said that it could be, but he said that it was frowned upon. He said that it was not impossible but would not be advised.

The Chair said that the issues around noise could be dealt with. He said that the highways objection remained and said that he agreed it was an already busy road.

Councillor Croft seconded the proposal of refusal.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for and 5 against with the Chair making the deciding vote for the application to be refused.)

Item 2 – DM/0355/23/FUL – Kingsway Club, 3 Kingsway, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application that sought planning permission to vary condition 2 (Limited Period) and 6 (Hours of Operation) pursuant to DM/0554/21/FUL to extend limited period and increase hours of operation up to 12am. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the committee due to the number of objections received. He said that the objections received cited issues such as noise, smoke, and disturbance. Mr Dixon stated that the site was located within the development boundary for Cleethorpes and operated as a bar. Mr Dixon said that the site had permission to operate as bar and also had temporary permission for outside seating. He said that the application was seeking to renew the permission for outside seating on a permanent basis and increase the opening hours by an additional one hour. Mr Dixon said that planning officers had worked with the environmental health officer regarding the application. He explained that there were premises close by that had longer opening hours than what was being proposed and, as the upstairs could be open until 12.00am, it could be considered unreasonable to object to the one-hour extension. Mr Dixon said that concerns had been raised by objectors regarding the rear smoking area. He said that the issues regarding the rear smoking area had been investigated previously by Environmental Health and that the rear smoking area's use was now restricted from 9.00pm due to an agreement between Environmental Health and the operator. Mr Dixon said that the highways officer had not objected to the application. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Webb spoke in objection to the application. He said he was speaking on behalf of other neighbours who were also concerned about the rear smoking garden. He said that if he had his windows open, smoke got into the house. Mr Webb stated that whilst the garden was scheduled to shut at 9.00pm, customers still used the garden in order to smoke and talk. Mr Webb said that if his windows were left open, he could smell the smoke. Mr Webb said that himself and other neighbours had always wanted the rear shelter to be moved. He said that taxis also operated around the back of the building. Mr Webb said that there had been instances of altercations with customers when residents had asked them to be quiet.

Mr Webb asked whether a condition could be added to have the shelter in the front.

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

The statement read that the reason for applying for the extra hour trading downstairs was to bring it into line with the club upstairs which was licensed until 12.00am. Domino and pool games were played upstairs and could continue past 11.00pm and the people had to leave the premises through the downstairs bar. Other than people playing domino and pool games upstairs, he would only need the extra hour for the Friday and Saturday nights. The bar was not a late bar and the clientele tended to start to leave from 10.00pm onwards. Mr Oglesby felt that the extra hour would guarantee he would not break any of his conditions and it would make it easier for his staff to control. He was also applying to renew the license for the seating area at the front which was very contained and did not infiltrate the footpath. The tables and chairs were only usually put out at weekends, weather permitting, but that they did enhance the business. Regarding the subject of objections, the committee may be unaware that all of the complaints were from the same family who had stated fictitious addresses and had duplicated their complaints as two of the objectors are the same person and they did not reside in the flats. Mr Oglesby wrote that another one of the objectors also did not live in the flats. He wrote that there were two businesses either side of his premises again, owned by the same family which both shut no later than 7.00pm. Mr Oglesby found it difficult to comprehend how an extra hour of trading would affect their business. Mr Oglesby felt that the other issues cited in objections had been dealt with by Mr Moody and Ms Thompson. The statement read that the beer garden was closed off at 9.00pm and that the condition would remain in place and was monitored regularly. Mr Oglesby did not tolerate anti-social behaviour at any time of the day or night. He noted that there were also two long term residents in the flats who had not put any complaints forward and also several residential properties at the back with no complaints. Mr Oglesby couldn't help feeling victimised and bullied by this family's continuous persecution of the business. He wrote that all he was asking for was the same trading conditions as other bars on the seafront. Mr Oglesby concluded his statement by stating that he ran a successful business which brought a safe and enjoyable environment to the seafront of Cleethorpes.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he could not see an issue with the requested extended opening hour. He said that he thought the smoking shelter at the rear was a big issue and he had huge sympathy for residents. Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he thought it needed to be conditioned that it closed at 9.00pm. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that he thought the rear smoking shelter should be closed off but said that Cleethorpes was a tourist resort and people

loved to sit outside. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that flats above drinking establishments were going to experience noise. He said that smokers should be going out the front and not smoking in the back area. Councillor Mickleburgh commented that it was illogical to have different hours for the upstairs and downstairs of the same business. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

The Chair said that extending the hours would bring everything into line. He said that the committee could defer the application in order for the relevant officers to look at the issue regarding the smoking shelter with the applicant.

Councillor Hasthorpe removed his proposal of approval. He proposed that the application be deferred.

Councillor Brasted seconded the proposal to defer the application.

Councillor Holland said that he had concerns about the issues regarding the smoking. He stated that the issue needed to be looked at.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought the smoking at the rear of the building was atrocious. Councillor Hudson said that he was going to query whether the committee could suggest that the smoking be moved to the front of the building, but he said that now he had heard that the back could not be completely closed off due to the fire escape, he was unsure. Councillor Hudson said that it was important to help the residents somehow.

Councillor Shutt said that he thought the application made sense. He said that the smoking was an issue.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that further discussion was needed and said that those discussions should include the licensing officers.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred.

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

Item 3 – DM/1098/22/OUT - Land South of Millennium Park, Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it was an outline application which sought to erect up to 80 dwellings, public open space, access, children's play equipment and drainage with all other matters other than access reserved. Mr Dixon said that the application included an indicative layout plan which would connect with the existing

Millennium Park housing estate which was currently under construction. Mr Dixon said that quite a few concerns had been raised and said that the application had been called in by a ward councillor. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed site was not part of an allocated site within the local plan. He said that the council's position as of April 2023 had changed and the titled balance no longer applied. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed plans showed that the development would also extend into the rural landscape beyond Humberston which would result in a visual intrusion which would be detrimental to the character and value of the countryside. Mr Dixon said that the site's planning history had been taken into account, but it was not considered that the planning history made the case for the development. Mr Dixon said that there were concerns regarding the number of dwellings which had been proposed. He said that the proposed eighty dwellings on the site would lead to the site being cramped. Mr Dixon said that the proposed narrowing of the open space gap to accommodate the eighty dwellings would also be harmful. Overall, it was considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. Mr Dixon said that the council's highways officer did not object to the application but said that more detail around parking would be needed at a later stage. Mr Dixon said that the application would lead to a 20% increase in biodiversity, however, Natural England were concerned that the application did not fully address a potential adverse ecological impact on the Humber Estuary. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed site was located within flood zone one and that a flood risk assessment had shown the proposed site would not generate flooding on the adjoining sites. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had submitted a drainage assessment but the council's drainage officer was not fully satisfied. He said that Anglian Water had also requested further information from the applicant. Mr Dixon said that some of the issues raised by the technical officers could potentially be overcome but the issue around the principle of the development remained. Mr Dixon stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 5, 22, 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and until Anglian Water, the council's drainage officer and Natural England were satisfied, the application was also not in accordance with policies 5, 33 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. Mr Dixon stated that the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Councillor Harness spoke in his capacity as a ward councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He said that the application had been called in by his fellow ward councillor, Councillor Shreeve. Councillor Harness said that the proposed site was unallocated. Councillor Harness stated that the council was now meeting housing supply targets and therefore development should be determined by the local plan. He stated that he fully supported the officer's recommendation of refusal.

Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Dawkins said that he was pleased to see that the council was now in a different position regarding housing supply. He said that he fully

supported the residents. Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he agreed with the statements from the other councillors and he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Hudson commented that he was in agreement with his fellow councillors.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Item 4 – DM/0879/22/FUL Land off Lambert Road and Ainslie Street, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect six apartments, two dwellings with associated boundary treatments and parking areas with associated works. He said that the site was a challenging site. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed site was located within an existing residential area of Grimsby, was close in proximity to the main town centre and was therefore considered sustainable. He said that the proposed site was a brownfield site and was also located within the designated development area of Grimsby outlined in the local plan. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed site was acceptable in principle. He said that the proposed site had previously had housing on it but the housing had been demolished. Mr Dixon said that the design and layout of the six apartments and two dwellings would largely compliment the area. Mr Dixon said that the proposed site was in flood zone three. He said that the application represented a regeneration of the site and had met the criteria of the Environment Agency's Memorandum of Understanding. Mr Dixon stated that that it had been agreed with the applicant that the floor levels be raised as required by the Environment Agency and said that this would not negatively impact the character of the area. He said that conditions had been included within the application regarding evacuation. Mr Dixon noted that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application. He explained that there had been several concerns around subsidence raised by objectors. Mr Dixon stated that the applicant had proposed augered piling to support the development following concerns raised by neighbours. Mr Dixon said that conditions regarding further details of the structure and piling were included within the application. Mr Dixon said that concerns had also been raised regarding parking. He explained that there would be one parking space for each of the residential units. Mr Dixon said that this was deemed sufficient as the eight units were not large family homes and would be unlikely to be lived in by families with multiple vehicles. Mr Dixon stated that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application. Mr Dixon stated that the application provided an opportunity to redevelop a site which was currently in a poor state. He

said that the proposed site was challenging but that, on balance, the positive benefits of redeveloping the site outweighed the issues. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 3, 4, 5, 22, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Cant spoke in objection to the application. He said that he had zero objections to the plans outlined for the front of the site but had serious concerns about the rear of the site. Mr Cant said that he was concerned about the proposed augured piling. He said that it would breach the aqua seal. Mr Cant said that it might be possible to undertake but said that it would be extremely challenging and technical. Mr Cant said that the issue of parking was also a concern for him.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that it was a challenging site. He said that the plan for was augured piling to take place to address concern about subsidence. Mr Deakins stated that the other issue was around the flood risk. He said that the floor levels would be raised. Mr Deakins said that the windows would also be arranged to match the street scene. Mr Deakins said that there had been previous pre-applications submitted but the site needed to be financially viable. Mr Deakins stated that the site had been empty for 35 years and did not look good on the street scene. He said that mitigation had been put in place to address the issues raised as much as possible.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that initially he thought it seemed like a straight forward approval. He said that the site was a brownfield site and would help with the demand for smaller properties. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was not an engineer but he thought the objector had raised some legitimate concerns. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that there was a need in the area for this type of property. He said that engineer issues were for engineers. He commented that he thought the application would make a vast improvement to the street scene. Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that he was aware of the site. He said that he was willing to support the application. He seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor Hudson said that he would have been happier if the rear of the site was left to garden space but was happy with the plans for the front of the site. He said that he understood the agent's point that the plans needed to be financially viable.

Councillor Shutt said that he went past the site a lot. He said that he thought the issue of bins that had been mentioned was a small issue but still an issue. Councillor Shutt said that he would rather see the development take place than the site to stay as it was. He said that he would support the application.

Councillor Holland said that the site had been empty for thirty-five years and he was pleased to see an application come to the table. He said that he would support the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Dawkins left the meeting.

Councillor Mickleburgh left the meeting.

Item 5 - DM/0060/23/FUL – Valley Cottage, Hatfield Road, West Ravendale

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought to demolish an existing bungalow, erect a two-storey dwelling with double garage, roof lights and associated works. Mr Limmer stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Limmer said that a previous application for the same site was refused by the committee and dismissed at appeal by the Inspector. Mr Limmer said that the applicant had sought to address the issues raised by the Inspector with the current application. Mr Limmer said that the previous application included a stable which had now been removed from the plans. Mr Limmer said that the site was located within the open countryside on the local plan. He said that policy 5 of the local plan did not preclude the replacement of existing dwellings but did require consideration into the impact of the proposed development on the character of the area. Mr Limmer stated that the application was acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer said that the application would not have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties residential amenities due to the position and scale of the proposed dwelling. Mr Limmer said that some of the objections cite there being a detrimental impact on the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Mr Limmer said that the proposed dwelling would be visible from Hatcliffe Road but said that several other dwellings were already visible in that area. He said that conditions had been included within the application to ensure that high quality materials were used to fit in with the area. Mr Limmer said that the council's tree officer had not objected to proposed works to trees. Mr Limmer said that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application but had requested that conditions be included within the application. Mr Limmer said that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application and had determined that the proposed development would not cause undue harm in terms of highways safety and amenity. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 12, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Newton spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the planning officers report was well considered. He said that the application was to replace an existing bungalow with a high-quality dwelling. Mr Newton said that the dwelling would be an attractive addition to the street scene and would be in keeping with the area. Mr Newton said that the existing bungalow was small and was difficult for a family to live there. He said that the previous application was refused due to the scale and design but said that the current application took those previous issues into account. Mr Newton said that the replacement dwelling would be a betterment to the site and said that all technical matters had been addressed. He said that he was happy to accept the conditions proposed by officers. Mr Newton asked the committee members to approve the application.

Mr Limmer informed committee members that an additional condition had been added to ensure the existing dwelling would be demolished.

Councillor Hudson said that the previous application outlined a very different scheme and said that the Inspector had agreed with the issues regarding that application. Councillor Hudson said that the applicant had done a good job in addressing those concerns with the current application. He said that he was surprised to see that the neighbour objections had remained. Councillor Hudson requested that a condition regarding permitted development be included.

Mr Dixon said that the conditions could be added.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved with the additional condition added.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson. He seconded the proposal to approve the application with the additional condition.

Councillor Shutt said that he agreed with the comments made by his fellow councillors.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 6 – DM/0180/23/REM - Land North of Main Road (Plot 5 Kings Chase), Barnoldby Le Beck

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought a variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) following DM/0843/22/REM to amend layout, position and design of dwelling and garage. Mr Limmer said that the application had been brought before the committee due to an objection from the Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council. He said that there had been objections received from

neighbours as well as neighbours supporting the application. Mr Limmer stated that the principle of the development had already been established under the original permission. Mr Limmer said that the proposed changes would not have a significant impact on the neighbours due to the presence of significant landscaping features along the boundaries. He said that the objections to the application from residents of Beck Farm Mews were acknowledged but said that the properties on Beck Farm Mews were well separated from the development. Mr Limmer said that the main impact the proposed amendments would have would be on the plots on Kings Chase, but he said that due to the screening and orientation of the dwelling, it was not considered that there would be an additional impact to the residential amenity of neighbours. Mr Limmer said that the proposed amendment would not impact the drainage scheme. He said that the proposed amendment would also not impact the access or parking arrangements. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 33 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he did not understand the objections that had been raised. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal of approval.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Holland left the meeting at this point.

Item 7 - DM/0800/22/FUL - The Grange, Aylesby Road, Great Coates

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect seven dwellings with associated access, parking, landscaping and boundary treatments. Mr Limmer said that the application had been brought before the committee due to a call in from Councillor Holland. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed site was located with the development boundary for Grimsby but said that the site was allocated as open space. He said that policy 5 did not preclude residential development within the defined development boundaries but did state that the proposals needed to be suitable. Mr Limmer said that the application also needed to be in accordance with policy 43. Mr Limmer said that the applicant had not provided evidence to show that the application would be in accordance with policy 43 as they had not shown that the open space was surplus to requirements. Mr Limmer said that the applicant had submitted ecology surveys but had not submitted a specific holistic assessment of biodiversity value. Mr Limmer said that the application was not acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer stated that some objections had been

raised by neighbours citing loss of privacy, however, the proposed dwellings would be well separated. He said that the proposed development would not cause undue harm to neighbour's residential amenities. As the proposed site was located within the grounds of the Grange, which was a Grade 2 listed building, there had been concerns raised by Historic England and Historic Buildings and Places. He said that the council's heritage officer had also objected to the application. Mr Limmer said that the concerns raised were regarding the impact on the setting of both the Grange and St Nicholas Church as well as the character of the conservation area. Mr Limmer said that the proposed site was located within flood zone one, which was preferable for development. He also said that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application but would need more detail on the surface water drainage system that would be in place. Mr Limmer stated that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application but had recommended conditions be included within the application. Mr Limmer said that overall, it had not been proven that the proposed development being allowed would justify the loss of green space. He said that it had also been determined that the proposed development would cause a significant harm to nearby heritage assets. Mr Limmer stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 5, 39 and 43 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan or sections 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Mr Limmer said that the application was recommended for refusal.

Miss Flemming spoke in objection to the application. She said that she was also speaking on behalf of other neighbours to reiterate their strong objections. She asked that the committee reject the application. Miss Flemming said that the application would cause an erosion to the existing boundary and would impact the nearby church. Miss Flemming stated that policy 39 was clear in its aim to preserve the character of conservation area. She said that the area was designated conservation land which was home to bats, woodpeckers and foxes. Miss Flemming said that residents were concerned about the drainage and the potential risk of flooding. Miss Flemming asked the committee to refuse the application.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the site was a valuable site. Mr Deakins stated that planning officers had only shown a few select photographs of the site which did not show the full extent of the site. Mr Deakins said that the site was broken up into small pockets. Mr Deakins said that the tree lined area was not of good quality. Mr Deakins said that the Grange Manor used to be farmhouse and the site used to be a farm. He said that he had looked at historical photos and had designed the proposed scheme in a way that respected the character. Mr Deakins asked committee members to support a site visit as he said that members needed to see all of the site. Mr Deakins said that he had previously been involved with a development close by that would give members an idea of what he had in mind for the current scheme.

Councillor Brasted said that as Freshney ward councillor she had not had any objections personally raised with her. She said that she would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Hudson said that he personally thought the scheme looked incredible but said that he was torn as he wanted to protect open spaces. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that you could not create land. He said that the land acted as a strategic gap. Councillor Hasthorpe said that no matter what you built on the land, it would still mean a loss of green space. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Shutt said that the scheme looked good. He said that he liked the passion of the objector. He commented that it might be an idea to visit the site as suggested by the agent.

Councillor Hudson proposed that a site visit take place.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal of a site visit.

The Chair said that the scheme was a nice design, but he said that he agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe. He seconded the proposal of refusal.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought the committee would benefit from a site visit.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that it was the wrong location for the proposed development.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for and 2 against for the application to be refused.)

Councillor Holland returned to the meeting at this point.

Councillor Pettigrew left the meeting.

COUNCILLOR HASTHORPE IN THE CHAIR

Item 8 - DM/0987/22/FUL – Land at Hall Farm Restaurant, Ashby Lane, Ashby Cum Fenby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect six holiday huts to include landscaping and a new access. Mr Limmer said that the application had been brought before the committee due to the number of objections received as well as an objection from Ashby Parish Council. Mr Limmer said that the site was located within the open countryside and had no specific allocation on the local plan. Mr Limmer said that policy 5 required that development in the open

countryside replicated the character and quality of the area and could be supported where development contributed to a prosperous rural economy. Mr Limmer stated that the development was acceptable in principle as it would contribute significantly to the rural economy and would also help maintain the existing hotel and restaurant. Mr Limmer said that the proposed development represented a significant financial investment at the site and would create additional jobs. Mr Limmer said that the closest residential property to the proposed huts would be the Hall. He said that the six holiday huts would not harm the residential amenity of the Hall due to the distance in separation. Mr Limmer said that the council's heritage officer had expressed concern that the proposed development would harm the setting of the adjacent listed buildings. Mr Limmer said that any harm caused would be minimal and said that the extensive landscaping being proposed would help with that. He said that, on balance, the potential harm would be minimal and would not outweigh the positive benefits the development would provide. Mr Limmer stated that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application but had recommended conditions. Mr Limmer said that the council's highways officer had determined that the six holiday huts would not cause a significant increase in traffic. Mr Limmer stated that the applicant had submitted an ecology survey which was deemed acceptable by the council's ecology officer. He said that the council's ecology officer had recommended conditions to be included in the application. Mr Limmer stated that there were representations received regarding the application citing a caravan site, he said that this was not part of the scheme and reiterated that the application was for six holiday huts.

Mr Durant spoke as the applicant. He asked the committee members to support the application. He said that Hall Farm Hotel and Restaurant was a small family business which had grown organically not aggressively. Mr Durant said that the project would create employment in the area and he commented that there were not many teenagers in the local area who hadn't worked for the business at some time. Mr Durant said that UK tourism was growing and he wanted to expand to meet the demand. Mr Durant said that he intended for the holiday huts to be for people wanting peace and tranquillity whilst away. He said that they would not be a nuisance. Mr Durant said that he would appreciate the support of the committee.

Councillor Hudson said that he could not understand what there was to not like about the development. He said that it was quirky and interesting. Councillor Hudson said that the huts would also be moveable if there ever were issues. He stated that he loved supporting well established local businesses. Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Batson said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Croft said that she thought it was a lovely opportunity. She said that she liked that the huts would not be permanent fixtures. Councillor Croft stated that she would support the application.

Councillor Shutt said he thought the development looked amazing. He said that he liked to see more natural looking materials used rather than brick. He commented that he would be supporting the application.

Councillor Holland said that he agreed with his fellow councillors. He queried the reference made by the parish council about caravans.

Mr Limmer reiterated that caravans were not a part of the application.

The Chair said that he thought it was great to see investment into the tourism sector.

RESOLVED – That the application to be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Pettigrew returned to the meeting at this point.

COUNCILLOR PETTIGREW IN THE CHAIR

Item 9 - DM//0320/23/OUT – Field House, Waltham Road, Brigsley

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought outline permission for the erection of one dwelling and provision of new access with all matters reserved. Mr Limmer said that the application had been brought before the committee due to objections received from neighbours. Mr Limmer said that the proposed site was located within a residential area of Brigsley. He said that the site was currently a residential garden. Mr Limmer said that policy 5 did not prohibit residential development within existing gardens where the site was within the development boundary. Mr Limmer said that the proposed site was located within flood zone one, which was preferable for development. He said that the development was acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer stated that there was an extant planning permission on the site. The council's highways officer had not objected to the application but had recommended conditions to be included in the application and had said that the access needed widening. Mr Limmer said that the development of one dwelling on the proposed site could be achieved without harm being caused to the character of the area. He said that the development would not cause a significant impact on the neighbouring residential amenities. Mr Limmer stated that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application but had recommended conditions to be included within the application. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and sections 5, 12, 14 and 15 of the National

Planning Policy Framework. He said that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Barker spoke as the applicant. He said that it was his view that he was asking for a minor amendment to a previously approved scheme that related to access only. He said that the original scheme was to share an access point but said that this was no longer able to happen. Mr Barker said that he was now proposing having an independent access. Mr Barker said that the separate access would be safe and have appropriate visible lines. He said that the application had been brought before the committee due to the four objections. Mr Barker said that one objection was received late and one was by someone who did not live close by. Mr Barker stated that the issue regarding the conifer tree had been dealt with previously and the objection around parking had been dealt with by the highways officer in their approval of the scheme. Mr Barker said that the principle of the development had already been agreed and he said the highways department had approved the access plans. Mr Barker asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 10 - DM/0384/23/FUL Land Adjacent to Co-Op, Station Road, New Waltham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect a detached unit for use as a cafe and hair and beauty salon at ground floor and residential flat at first floor with associated works. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to a call in from a Ward Councillor and the number of objections received. Mr Dixon said that the proposed site had extant planning permission. He said that the amended scheme included a residential flat which would mean there being a larger first floor than what had previously been proposed. Mr Dixon said that the application was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon said that some objections had been received citing concern over size of the development, overshadowing, loss of light, noise, and loss of privacy. Mr Dixon said that the inclusion of one residential unit was not considered to be detrimental to residential amenity. He said that it was common to have residential flats above commercial properties. Mr Dixon stated that the objections had been taken into account, but he said that due to the slope of the roof and the separations from neighbours, it was not considered that the development would cause adverse massing, loss of light or overlooking. Mr Dixon said that the Environment Team had requested conditions regarding a construction management plan and hours of operation be included. Mr Dixon said that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application but had recommended a condition

regarding a construction traffic management plan. Mr Dixon said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 28, 33, 34 and 38 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and sections 7, 11, 12 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework. He said the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Holmes spoke in objection to the application. He said that he had raised no objections to the original plans, however, he said the new plans included a two-bedroom flat which would not be in keeping with the scale of the area. Mr Holmes said that the first-floor elevation would go way beyond the length of his property. He said that the proposed development would mean a loss of sun light and would impact the effectiveness of his solar panels. Mr Holmes said that the development would lead to a loss of privacy for him as people would be able to look straight into his property. He said that he had further concerns around noise, and said that the business hours were fine, but a flat could mean twenty-four hours of noise. Mr Holmes said that the parking facilities would not be adequate. Mr Holmes said that his neighbour shared his concerns around noise and privacy. Mr Holmes said that he would be happy for the committee to undertake a site visit so they could see firsthand the issues.

Mr Hyde spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the current proposal was to change the first floor to a flat. He said that the flat had been sensitively designed to not impact the property to the east. Mr Hyde said that there would be a cap style roof to take away any massing impact on the neighbour. Mr Hyde said that the noise generated by a single flat would not be detrimental to the neighbours. Mr Hyde said that the principle of the development had already been established. He asked committee members to support the application.

Councillor Harness spoke as a ward councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He said that the proposed site had already been granted planning permission. He said previously there had only been one objection at the time and said that the immediate neighbours did not object. Councillor Harness said that the immediate neighbours initially welcomed the idea as they saw the obvious benefits that the application would bring to the village. Councillor Harness said that the neighbours now strongly object to the application. He said that the changes to the application were significant. He said that the first-floor elevation had been extended and said that whilst the roof would soften the visual impact, the view would be different. Councillor Harness said that the developer had not made any attempt to consult with the neighbours and said that if they had there was the possibility that the issues could have been solved.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he sympathized with the neighbour but could not see a planning reason to object to the application.

Councillor Hudson said he had sympathy for the neighbour. He said that the neighbour was initially happy with the application but said that the applicant had now changed the initial plan. Councillor Hudson said that he understood the reason for the applicant wanting a flat. However, he said

that the neighbour would clearly suffer from the massing. Councillor Hudson said that he did not think he would be able to support the application. He said that he thought the neighbours were good to accept the previous proposal but said that this proposal was unfair. Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Croft said that she agreed with Councillor Hudson. She said that where the initial application to have included the flat, it would have been refused. Councillor Croft seconded the proposal of refusal.

Councillor Shutt said that he had sympathy for the neighbour. He commented that he thought the applicant needed to speak to the neighbours to work towards a solution. Councillor Shutt said that he would be supporting the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Holland stated that he could not support the application. He said that there may be scope to change the application to work for all parties, but in its current form, he could not support the application.

Mr Dixon sought clarification on reasons for the proposal of refusal. He said that members had mentioned an overdevelopment of the site, a detriment to the neighbours and concerns over massing and dominance.

Councillor Hudson and Councillor Croft agreed that those were the reasons for proposing and seconding the motion of refusal.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Item 11 - DM/0824/22/FUL – 40-42 High Street, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought change of use of the ground floor from a bank to take-away and restaurant, installation of flues with associated internal alterations. Mr Dixon said that the application had previously been before the Planning Committee where it was deferred to allow for more discussions to take place regarding sound proofing. Mr Dixon said that this issue had now been resolved and the council's environmental protection officer had confirmed she was satisfied with the plans. Mr Dixon said that the council's Building Control team had also confirmed they were happy with the plans. Mr Dixon said that there had been objections raised regarding potential odour. He said that further detail had been provided to the council's environmental protection officer regarding the method of dealing with this who had determined that the method proposed would not have an undue impact. Mr Dixon said that the application would bring back into use a vacant building within the town centre of Cleethorpes. He said that with the conditions in place, there would not be an undue impact on the amenity of neighbours. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in

accordance with policies 5, 22 and 23 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was recommended for approval with conditions.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of Mr Saxby.

The statement read that he would like to thank Councillor Farren, the Case Officer Ms Davidson, the Chair and Members of the planning committee for taking the time to listen to his concerns that he had raised, Mr Saxby wrote that he would also like to thank them for addressing the issues by way of conditions being imposed on the application.

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

Councillor Farren wrote that she was happy with the application as long as all of the conditions had been agreed to.

Councillor Hudson said that it was great to see the applicant and objector work together to resolve issues. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson. He seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe commented that he agreed with his fellow councillors.

Councillor Holland queried whether there was a condition regarding opening hours.

Mr Dixon referred committee members to condition four outlined in the report.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 12 – DM/0309/23/FUL – Manor House, Tetney Road, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought a variation of Condition 15 (Approved Plans) as granted on DM/1105/22/FUL for revision to install solar panels to rear roof slope and relocate flue. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to an objection from the Humberston Village Council. Mr Dixon said that the principle of development was well established on the site. He said that the changes proposed included a modified flue position which would move the flue to the front of the dwelling and the addition of some solar panels to go on the rear roof slope. Mr Dixon said that the proposed changes didn't impact the

principle of the development. Mr Dixon said that the council's heritage officer had objected to the application on the grounds that the solar panels would have a harmful effect to the setting of the heritage assets. Mr Dixon said that policy 32 supported energy efficient and low carbon development. He said that there needed to be a balance between creating sustainable homes and protecting heritage assets. Mr Dixon said that it was accepted that there would be some harm caused but said that on balance the impact could be accommodated given the benefits the application would bring. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Hart spoke as the applicant. He said we were heading to a climate crisis and that North East Lincolnshire Council's mission statement was to go green. Mr Hart said that solar had lots of benefits. He had worked with planning officers on his application. Mr Hart said that he wanted to create a build that complimented the heritage whilst also being considered modern. He said that the dwelling would have a modern sunroof.

Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

P.6 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 17th April – 1st June 2023.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.7 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.8 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.9 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 2.25pm.