



PLANNING COMMITTEE

2nd September 2026 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Patrick (in the Chair)

Councillors Batson, Bright, Emmerson, Goodwin, Hudson, Kaczmarek, Jackson (substitute for Parkinson), Lindley, Mayne, and Taylor (substitute for Callison)

Officers in attendance:

- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Jonathan Cadd (Principal Planner)
- Richard Limmer (Principal Planner – Major Projects)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Adam Brockbank (Assistant Transport Planner Highway Development Control)
- Tracy Lovejoy (Agency Lawyer)
- Charlotte Trench (Trainee Solicitor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

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

P.26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.27 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bright declared another registerable interest in P.29 Item 2 DM/0272/26/FUL and Item 3 DM/0273/26/ADV as he had previously objected to the applications.

Councillor Emmerson declared another registerable interest in P.29 Item 4 DM/0907/25/FUL as his brother and sister in law lived close to the site.

Councillor Taylor declared another registerable interest in P.29 Item 2 DM/0272/26/FUL and Item 3 DM/0273/26/ADV as he had previously objected to the applications.

Councillor Batson stated that for P.29 Item 8 DM/0059/26/FUL he had previously visited the site prior to joining the Planning Committee. Ms Lovejoy advised that whilst Councillor Batson had previously spoken to the applicant, he had not indicated that he supported any particular outcome of the application and he therefore did not have to leave the room during the application's determination.

P.28 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 5th August 2026 be approved as a correct record.

P.29 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Item 1 - DM/0631/25/FUL - Torq Garage, Scartho Road, Grimsby

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that the item had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He explained that the application had previously been considered by the Planning Committee on 22nd April 2026, where it had been decided that the application be deferred in order for a site visit to take place. Mr Cadd confirmed that the site visit had now taken place. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Cadd advised that an additional condition was recommended requiring final details of the spray booth design. He further stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Johnson spoke in objection to the application. He thanked committee members for taking the time to visit the site and neighbouring properties. Mr Johnson stated that he was also speaking on behalf of another neighbour. He stated that they both owned and lived in the houses adjoining the site. Mr Johnson said that they opposed the plan to develop a Greggs bakery and upgrades to the jet wash against the perimeter of their properties. Mr Johnson stated that in his previous comments made to the Planning Committee, he had given the applicant an alternative solution to re-site the bakery to the area of the proposed, demolished car wash. Mr Johnson considered that this would create an in-shop food service similar to Bradley Spar and Laceby Services. He stated that as committee members would be aware, the proposal would be close to their properties and would have a negative impact on their way of life. Mr Johnson stated that since he had last spoken to the Planning Committee he had raised concerns regarding light, noise and maintenance with the owners, who had taken no action. He also said that the sap from the tree

continued to stain his windows and garden, and the refurbished vacuum whistled loudly into his home. He stated that deliverers continued to run their generators all of which was amplified by the canopy. Mr Johnson further stated that they felt that the nuisance would increase with the proposed development, during both the construction phase and when in operation. He welcomed the committee members comments following their visit. Mr Johnson stated that the jet wash, trees and light overwhelmed their properties and asked if the application were to be approved, what measures would be taken by the applicant to ensure their daily living was not affected. He also asked how any spray from the new jet wash going onto their properties would be mitigated. He stated that he trusted that the owners would listen to their concerns and take the necessary action. Mr Johnson said that he hoped the Planning Committee would reject the proposal and suggest that any future development on the site reflect the concerns raised by the adjoining property owners to protect their quality of living.

Ms Ford spoke as the planning consultant for the application. Ms Ford stated that the application related to an existing operational service station which offered fuel, car wash, jet wash, and car repair facilities and also a sales building. Ms Ford wished to outline the changes that had been made since the last meeting. She stated that as previously, she supported the officer's report and stated that at the last meeting, specific issues were raised about the existing jet wash, the location and orientation of the sales building extension, its entrance door as well as other matters. She advised that in terms of the extension, alternate locations were considered and discussed with the planning officer, including the relocation of the extension to the rear of the sales building which was not deemed practical due to the internal configuration of the existing layout. Ms Ford said that they had looked at placing the extension on the other side of the sales building near the exit, however it was considered that this would not work operationally due to the access and egress from the site. She further stated that they had then looked at the existing proposal with the sales building extension where it was and decided to remove the entrance which would allow customers to enter the building through the existing entrance. Ms Ford said that this would go some way to removing activity from the boundary and that alternative would be an improvement on the scheme the Planning Committee had considered previously. Ms Ford also stated that the existing jet wash on the site was unusually tall and more imposing than most jet washes. She said that the updated proposal was to replace the jet wash entirely with a smaller building of more appropriate scale, designed with spray barriers and to prevent noise. Ms Ford stated that the applicant would be supportive of a condition that would stipulate that the jet wash only be used between the hours of 8am – 8pm, this being a significant improvement on the existing situation. She also stated that the noise report had been further updated to reflect both those changes, and the council's environmental protection team were happy with the proposal subject to conditions. Ms Ford said that the applicant was happy to accept the suggested conditions including opening hours, plant operation hours and post development noise verification. Ms Ford stated that the comments made in relation to the boundary wall were noted and these

had been shared with the applicant. Ms Ford stated that the applicant was happy for repair works to take place during the building works as part of the contractors scope. She also stated that the application had been subject to ongoing discussions and evolution, this included retaining the existing hours of the wider site, restrictions on the jet wash and bakery use hours, change to the jet wash and the removal of the car wash. Ms Ford stated that the applicant would adhere to the conditions and hoped that this would improve the amenity for local residents. Furthermore, Ms Ford asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson stated that what had been proposed for the jet wash was an improvement as it was going to be smaller and quieter. He stated that the most significant part was the change in the hours of operation of the jet wash which could currently be used until 11.00pm whereas it would not be able to be used after 8.00pm if the application were approved. Councillor Hudson stated that the bakery would be five metres away from the boundary and would be single storey. He said that the door had also been moved, to allow for anyone using the bakery to enter through the existing garage door. Councillor Hudson stated that if the application were approved, the car wash would also be removed. He said that there were also conditions proposed to protect residents. Councillor Hudson stated that he did not believe the development would have as significant an impact as residents anticipated

Councillor Lindley stated that he agreed with Councillor Hudson that there had been some improvements made to the scheme that would benefit residents. He also raised concerns about the proposal's potential effect on traffic flow on Scartho Road. Councillor Lindley stated that he knew the site well and had experienced the petrol station during busy periods, noting that there was often queuing traffic waiting to get in. He stated that this was particularly evident on the section of Scartho Road between Nuns Corner and the traffic lights, where two lanes were available, but one lane could be obstructed by vehicles queuing to enter the petrol station. Councillor Lindley further stated that there appeared to be an assumption that all customers using the bakery would also be purchasing fuel from the petrol station; however, he did not believe this would necessarily be the case, as some customers may visit solely to use the bakery. He was also concerned where people would park their vehicles as he could not see anywhere else where they could safely park their vehicles without causing an obstruction. Councillor Lindley stated that, if the bakery attracted a significant number of customers, it could result in vehicles queuing for access, creating a backlog for those wishing to use the petrol station. He further noted that customers who purchased fuel before visiting the bakery would likely remain on the site for longer, resulting in vehicles occupying the bays for extended periods while other vehicles waited. Overall, Councillor Lindley did not think the site was big enough to accommodate these levels of traffic, particularly when fuel was in high demand, the site was clearly not big enough to accommodate additional vehicles, not there for the petrol station. He said that he would continue to listen to the rest of the debate before making a decision.

Councillor Batson also stated that he knew the site well, he was aware that lots of children from the nearby school, crossed the road to use the garage shop. He said that it had also become a place for residents of the Nunsthorpe to get their food and drink. Councillor Batson stated that he believed the presence of a Greggs bakery would attract more children to the site. He noted that between 100 and 200 children currently crossed the road to use the existing shop before continuing to the Nunsthorpe area. He stated that he did not believe sufficient consideration had been given to the number of children who currently use the shop and then crossed back over the road towards the Nunsthorpe. He stated that the garage shop received a significant proportion of its custom from children who used the shop.

Councillor Hudson stated that there were at least four parking spaces available on the site and noted that, during the site visit, he had observed a customer park and use the shop without purchasing fuel. He also observed pedestrians using the shop. Councillor Hudson added that the current arrangement operated effectively and saw no reason why this would not continue in the future.

The Chair sought clarification on how many parking spaces there were on site for those not there using the filling station. Mr Cadd responded that there were three designated parking spaces and that there was also a forecourt area which allowed for some vehicles to queue.

Mr Brockbank stated that the Highways Department had raised no concerns regarding the proposal. He noted that, in his experience, the fuel pumps were rarely operating at full capacity and that there were eight spaces adjacent to the pumps available for customers should the general parking spaces be occupied. He further stated that there was an additional apron area shortly after entering the site and as a result, it was not considered likely that vehicles would queue back onto the public highway.

Councillor Bright stated that Councillor Lindley had explained his main concerns. He stated that, while he acknowledged the comments that there was sufficient space for vehicles on site, and officers had confirmed that the introduction of a bakery would not increase the number of vehicle trips greatly during peak times, he expressed concern that customers purchasing fuel may also visit the bakery, where queues could form, resulting in vehicles remaining on site for longer periods and increasing the time spent occupying the fuel pumps. Overall he still had concerns about the proposed development's impact on traffic.

Councillor Lindley commented that, in relation to parking on the site, fuel tanker deliveries were typically unloaded just inside the site entrance. As a result, any parking spaces in that area would be unavailable for use while deliveries were taking place.

Councillor Jackson largely agreed with the points raised by Councillor Hudson. He acknowledged the concerns expressed by Councillor Lindley regarding traffic but noted that a mitigation measure was proposed; the

removal of the car wash. He considered that this would reduce the number of vehicles accessing the site and, therefore, help offset any additional traffic generated by the bakery. Councillor Jackson stated that, in his view, the potential traffic impacts were not as significant as some had suggested.

Councillor Emmerson noted that the site was situated in close proximity to two junctions and stated that vehicles exiting the site entered directly onto a public highway at a point controlled by traffic signals. In his view, this already presented a significant risk which would only be exacerbated by the proposed development. He commented that similar facilities operated successfully at locations such as Laceby Lodge and Moody Lane, but noted that those sites benefited from substantially larger parking areas. Councillor Emmerson further observed that such sites were regularly used by tradespeople driving larger vehicles, meaning parking demand was not limited to smaller cars. He considered that the proposed development represented an over intensification of the site, given its size and location. He added that, although Members had been able to observe the existing levels of light and noise during the site visit, they had not been able to assess the potential impacts that could arise should the application be approved. Councillor Emmerson concluded by stating that he could not identify any aspect of the proposal that he supported.

Councillor Bright stated that some of the objectors had raised concerns about the light spill and asked whether there was a condition regarding lighting.

Mr Cadd responded that there was no additional external lighting proposed for the bakery. He advised that the site was an operational filling station and was permitted to use its lights. Mr Cadd stated that it was likely that separate applications for advertisements would be submitted in the future. He acknowledged that bakery staff would be required to attend the site earlier in the day to begin food preparation but advised that this would not necessitate the use of any additional external lighting beyond that already permitted. He explained that the only external lighting required during those hours would be the existing security lighting, together with internal lighting within the building.

Councillor Bright felt that the bakery was being introduced to help the business increase its profits and said he would expect that to result in more people visiting the site. He commented that it seemed unlikely the bakery would be added unless there was an expectation of attracting additional customers. As a result, he remained concerned about the potential impact on traffic.

Regarding the issue of queuing, Councillor Mayne could not envisage people blocking the lane outside the traffic lights and queuing just to go into Greggs. He felt that if people saw that the car park was full, people would go the next one and would not wait in traffic.

Councillor Emmerson proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Lindley seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

The Chair sought clarification as to the reasons for their proposal.

Councillor Emmerson stated that he did not believe there had been a thorough assessment of the movements of traffic, types of vehicles that would use the site, the location of the site being close to two junctions and considered the traffic management plan to not be fit for purpose.

Councillor Lindley stated that there was a risk of vehicles queueing at the site access and felt that the site was not large enough to provide sufficient parking for customers who were visiting the bakery or shop rather than using the petrol station.

Councillor Emmerson said that he also thought what was proposed was an over intensification of the site given the nature of its size and location and it would have a negative impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of light and noise pollution.

Mr Dixon said that based on comments made by Councillor Emmerson and Councillor Lindley, they felt that the proposal would lead to an increase in use of the site due to a third commercial offer, there was also a lack of parking on site and congestion to the light onto a main junction which would be detrimental to highway safety and contrary to policy five of the Local Plan.

Councillor Jackson reiterated that the car wash would be removed and suggested that it currently generated trips to the site from people who were not necessarily purchasing fuel. He considered that its removal would reduce some of that traffic and therefore provide a degree of mitigation against any additional journeys associated with the proposed bakery.

Mr Cadd clarified that the jet wash facility had been on site since 1991 but had been added to over the years.

The committee voted on the proposal to refuse the application. Upon being put to the vote, five members voted in favour of refusal and six members voted against.

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

Councillor Jackson seconded the proposal to approve the application with conditions and the additional condition.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Bright and Councillor Taylor left the meeting at this point.

Item 2 - DM/0272/26/FUL - Anthonys Bank Car Park, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that the item had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received and also due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of Mr Stephenson who had objected to the application.

Mr Stephenson wrote that he was not opposing sensible management of the car park and if there was genuine anti-social behaviour, unauthorised overnight occupation or misuse, it should be dealt with. He raised further concerns as to whether the solution before the Planning Committee particularly the permanent 2.3 metre height barrier was evidenced, necessary and proportionate, and whether its consequences had been properly considered. Mr Stephenson wrote that having read the officer's report and after visiting the site at the weekend, he would ask Members to consider five questions. He asked Members to consider what problem the height barrier was intended to address and whether there was any evidence to demonstrate that it would be effective in resolving that issue. Mr Stephenson referred to the officer's report which stated that the applicant's claim of anti-social behaviour "has not been substantiated" and felt that this statement seemed important. Mr Stephenson asked what was the scale of the problem? How many incidents had occurred? When did they occur? How many involved campervans or high-sided vehicles? He wrote that without that information, how could committee members judge whether permanently excluding those vehicles was a proportionate response. Mr Stephenson asked committee members to consider why less restrictive measures had not been exhausted. He wrote that there was already a gate at Anthony's Bank, as well as signage at the site indicating closing arrangements, and local experience suggested that the existing gate had not routinely been used to close and secure the car park. He further noted that the application also proposed ANPR. Mr Stephenson questioned whether a permanent height barrier was necessary if the main concern related to overnight occupation. He asked whether the existing gate could be managed more effectively overnight and whether ANPR could be used to enforce overnight restrictions, rather than introducing a barrier that would restrict access throughout the day. Mr Stephenson also felt that before introducing another restriction, we should consider whether the controls already available would solve the identified problem. He asked committee members to consider where the excluded vehicles would go. Mr Stephenson stated that, while a parking charge allowed motorists to choose whether to pay or park elsewhere, a 2.3-metre height barrier would remove that choice entirely for drivers of taller vehicles. He also noted that such vehicles were not exclusively campervans seeking to stay

overnight, but were often used by a range of legitimate visitors to the area. Mr Stephenson further noted that the coastline was used by kite surfers, windsurfers, paddleboarders, anglers, horse riders and other recreational users, many of whom legitimately travelled in vans to transport large or bulky equipment. He wrote that these activities were dependent on access to the coastline and could not simply be relocated elsewhere. Mr Stephenson wrote that the Highways Authority acknowledged that the proposals may displace vehicles into the Humberston Fitties road network, including a route used by visitors, servicing and emergency vehicles. He wrote that the fact that those roads were private did not make that displacement disappear. Mr Stephenson asked committee members to consider the history of the site. He wrote that longstanding residents would remember a substantially larger public parking area, with facilities including public toilets and Jenny's Café, extending much closer to the foreshore but as the holiday park developed, that arrangement had now changed. Mr Stephenson further noted that caravans were subsequently positioned closer to the beachfront and that the public car park was relocated into its current position. He wrote that the officer's report recorded the 2004 planning permission for the formation of the car park and siting of caravans, including a condition requiring that the car park remain public. Mr Stephenson wrote that that history mattered and that this was therefore not simply about a private commercial operator deciding how to manage an ordinary private car park, it concerned the remaining public car park serving a coastline which generations of local residents had accessed and enjoyed. In conclusion, Mr Stephenson asked Members to consider whether the proposal was proportionate. He argued that, if ANPR, overnight restrictions and the existing gate could adequately address the concerns identified, it was necessary to question why a measure that would permanently exclude legitimate daytime users was required. He stated that the four questions below should be satisfactorily addressed before planning permission was granted.

What evidenced harm requires the height barrier?
 Why can the existing gate and ANPR not address that harm?
 Which legitimate users will the barrier exclude?
 And where will those vehicles go?

Mr Stephenson further added that if those questions could not presently be answered, the proportionate decision was not necessarily to reject sensible parking management altogether. He asked committee members to either defer the application for proper assessment of need, alternatives and displacement, or to consider allowing the ANPR and parking-management measures without the permanent height restriction, at least until the need for such a barrier had been demonstrated. Mr Stephenson noted that this was not an argument for unrestricted overnight camping but for evidence-led, proportionate management which solved the problem without unnecessarily restricting public access to the coastline. He concluded that once access was removed, it was considerably harder to restore, and asked committee members to consider that before voting on the application.

Mr Cox spoke as the agent for the application. He stated that he appreciated that there had been various objections received in relation to the application particularly concerning the introduction of parking charges and potential displacement of vehicles. Mr Cox said that it was however important to distinguish those concerns from the planning application before the Planning Committee. He advised that the application was not proposing to change the use of the site, or remove the car park and confirmed it would remain a public car park. Mr Cox also stated that the planning application was for infrastructure to manage its operation. He stated that the officer's report confirmed that there was no planning objection to the principle of charging for parking and the council's estates officer had also confirmed that the proposal does not breach the existing lease. Mr Cox also noted that the applicant had explained that the measures were necessary to address ongoing operational problems, including anti-social behaviour, unauthorised overnight parking, long term parking and inappropriate use by campervans. He said that similar measures had been introduced by North East Lincolnshire Council at the nearby Marine Walk Car Park for almost identical reasons. Mr Cox further stated that one of the concerns that had been raised in some of the objections, was that the proposed height barrier would restrict access to the car park for recreational users, such as kite surfers and paddleboarders. He noted that whilst the precise operation of the barrier had not yet been finalised, the applicant had confirmed that the car park would remain available for recreational users and that the sole purpose of the barriers was to prevent overnight use by campervans. Mr Cox stated that the detailed arrangements for managing the access were still to be determined however one option was to have the barrier swung back during daytime hours therefore allowing recreational users to continue to access the car park as they currently did. He stated that no technical consultee had objected to the application including the Highways Authority which was satisfied that there would be no material impact on the adopted highway including from displaced vehicles. Mr Cox stated that officers had also concluded that the existing tree screening and the nature of the works, would not have an unacceptable impact on the character or setting. He stated that committee members were not being asked to determine whether parking chargers were desirable but instead were being asked whether the proposed infrastructure was acceptable in planning terms. Mr Cox confirmed that planning officers had determined that it was, and as such he asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson stated that he accepted officers' advice that there were no planning grounds on which to object to the application. However, he said that the proposal made him feel uncomfortable, given that local residents had enjoyed free use of the car park for many years and that it was one of the few remaining places where people could park without charge. He added that he was not convinced by the reasons put forward in support of the proposal, as he did not feel there was sufficient evidence before Members to substantiate them. Councillor Hudson reiterated that, whilst he accepted there was nothing objectionable in planning terms, he remained uncomfortable with the proposal and expressed sympathy for those who regularly used the car park.

Councillor Jackson stated that, regardless of members' personal views on the introduction of parking charges, that was not the matter before the committee. He noted that the Planning Committee's role was to determine whether the proposed infrastructure was acceptable in planning terms and that officers had advised that it was. Councillor Jackson reminded members that they needed to consider the application from a planning perspective rather than from the viewpoint of regular visitors to Cleethorpes.

Councillor Mayne agreed with Councillor Hudson and felt that what was proposed was morally wrong.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she disagreed with Councillor Hudson and agreed with Councillor Jackson's view that Members needed to consider the application from a planning perspective. She emphasised that the Committee's role was to assess the proposal on its planning merits rather than on personal views about the changes being proposed. She also felt that some control was needed in the car park.

Councillor Lindley stated that Members needed to focus on the matter before them and make their decision based on the planning issues under consideration. He noted that the application related to the proposed infrastructure and not to whether parking charges would be introduced. Councillor Lindley stated that the situation was a difficult one, given that the car park had been free to use for many years. However, he emphasised that it was not the role of the Planning Committee to decide whether the introduction of parking charges was right or wrong. He noted that Members were required to consider the planning merits of the application rather than the principle of charging for parking.

Mr Dixon clarified that it was the infrastructure aspects that the Planning Committee were considering. He stated that as the planning agent had spoken about the barrier being open during the day, a condition could be added securing this aspect.

Councillor Goodwin proposed that the application be approved with conditions and with the additional condition of the barrier being open during the day.

Councillor Jackson seconded the proposal to approve the application with conditions and the additional condition.

Mr Dixon stated that the condition would outline that the hours that the barrier be opened this being from 7.00am to 10.00pm all year round.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for and 3 against with 1 abstention for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 3 – DM/0273/26/ADV – Anthonys Bank Car Park, Humberston

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

Councillor Hudson stated that, with the other application having now been approved by the Planning Committee, he considered this application to be the next logical step.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved with conditions.

Councillor Jackson seconded the proposal to approve the application with conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for and 3 against for the application to be approved with conditions.)

The Chair clarified, for the avoidance of doubt, that members were not being asked to vote on whether parking charges should be introduced at the car park. He emphasised that the vote related solely to the proposed infrastructure and wished to make that distinction clear.

Councillor Bright and Councillor Taylor returned to the meeting.

Councillor Emmerson left the meeting at this point.

Item 4 - DM/0907/25/FUL - Land Off Woodland Way, Grimsby Road, Waltham

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to it being a departure from the Local Plan as well as there being an objection from Waltham Parish Council and four objections from neighbours. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report. Mr Limmer stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He considered that the site had a lot of history and noted that he had previously been before the Planning Committee speaking with regard to the site. He stated that the site was outside of the current Local Plan boundary. He added that this would not be the case for much longer, as the site had been identified in

the site selection document that formed part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan. Mr Deakins said that the site would be included in the new Local Plan. He stated that planning officer's had noted in their report that "there was no insurmountable barriers for the site being developed". Mr Deakins emphasised that national policy supported the application given the current circumstances of the area's housing supply. He further noted that the previous reasons for applications for the site being refused were in relation to the character of the area and how the site related to the settlement gap between Waltham and Scartho. Mr Deakins noted that he was aware of sites that had been granted planning permission in the intervening time on the Scartho side and other applications that were pending. He stated that they had looked to address that as much as they could and also address issues outlined in the previous decisions to refuse the site planning permission. Mr Deakins stated that they had tried to group properties close to the Waltham side as much as possible in order to meet the countryside with a green open space. He referred to the drawing shown on the officer's presentation and noted that about forty percent was open green space or public road. Mr Deakins said that he considered that was an acceptable and appropriate response to meet the countryside with green space. He stated that when he had previously been before the Planning Committee to speak about the site, there had been objectors speaking at the meeting, however now nearly all residents had submitted comments in support of the application which was a noticeable change. Mr Deakins stated that the proposal effectively finished off the existing phase two of Woodlands Way. He stated that he had spoken to a couple of residents who had previously been aggrieved at the idea of more houses being built, but now after having lived in the area for some time they could see the logic of completing the site. Mr Deakins stated that in terms of the other site that the applicant owned on the corner of Grimsby Road and Station Road, a new permission had been granted for a more bungalow-oriented scheme. He stated that they were just working through the last of the pre-commencement planning conditions and were getting ready to start that development. Mr Deakins stated that what was proposed was a good scheme and included a lot of new infrastructure and green space and was supported by a good proportion of the immediate neighbours and was a site that was earmarked for the upcoming Local Plan.

Councillor Jackson stated that he was not going to be supporting the application. He noted that the site was outside of the current Local Plan, and whilst the site might be proposed to be included in the new revised Local Plan, the council had not approved a new revised Local Plan as of yet. Councillor Jackson further stated that the committee was having to consider the application because of what he regarded as unrealistic housing targets, which he said were the primary reason the authority could no longer demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. He stated that without that, he was fairly sure the application would not be before the Planning Committee. Councillor Jackson stated that applications for the site had previously been refused by the Planning Committee and those decisions to refuse had been upheld at appeal. He noted that historically the main reason why the site had not been approved was due to it forming

part of the strategic gap between Waltham and Scartho and it was important to try and retain that. Councillor Jackson also considered that both Waltham and Scartho had, had more than their fair share of new housing developments in recent years and neither of those villages were able to have the infrastructure to be able to support the housing numbers we were seeing in those locations. He further stated that whilst what was proposed was only nine homes, cumulatively all the smaller development added up, overwhelmed the infrastructure and eat into the strategic gap. Councillor Jackson stated that the Planning Committee should be consistent with previous decisions, refuse the application and uphold the Local Plan which was currently enforced.

Councillor Kaczmarek stated that he had been through the comments and was pleasantly surprised with Waltham Parish Council and although he didn't agree with their conclusion, he could understand how they had reached their conclusion. He stated that he couldn't see how the proposed development would remove the strategic gap as it was not pushing closer to Scartho as part of Waltham already was and was also not pushing closer to New Waltham. Councillor Kaczmarek stated that what was proposed was not a massive development and there was a nice green wedge that would still be there. He stated that he saw no grounds to refuse the application.

Councillor Lindley stated that he would be doing his residents a disservice to support anything that would reduce the strategic gap between Waltham and Scartho any further. He said that although it may only be nine houses now, this could increase very quickly. Councillor Lindley was concerned that the gap would get narrower and narrower. He stated that on the other side of the strategic gap, there was an appeal pending on the land on Grimsby Road to Louth Road and if that was successful that would impact the strategic gap too. Councillor Lindley stated that the strategic gap was being eroded from both sides. He said that residents felt very strongly about the identity of Scartho and did not wish to see the villages together. Councillor Lindley stated that he supported what Councillor Jackson had said in that the site was not in the current Local Plan and therefore was not an allocated site. He felt that the application should not be approved.

Councillor Bright stated that he had been looking at the site's planning history. He referred to the planning inspectorate's decision from December 2023 which stated that the planning inspectorate had not been concerned with the strategic gap but instead was concerned about building in the open countryside. Councillor Bright noted that the height difference between bungalows and houses would not change that concern as there would still be buildings in the open countryside. He referred to paragraph twenty four of the planning inspectorate's decision where they had determined that "even if the Council did have a shortfall in their supply of housing, officers consider the harm that was identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the increased supply of dwellings promoted through this windfall site when assessed against the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole." Councillor Bright further stated that this was the planning inspectorate's position in

December 2023 and that there had since been changes to the National Planning Policy Framework. He asked whether due to those changes, whether that position would be overruled.

Mr Dixon responded that it would not as under the National Planning Policy Framework you still need to have regard to the character of the area and that was a fair consideration.

Councillor Bright stated that the proposal in December 2023 was for nine bungalows and the current application was for nine bungalows so therefore nothing had changed since the planning inspectorate's decision. He stated that the Planning Inspectorate had indicated that, even where the Council could not demonstrate a sufficient housing land supply, permission could still be refused where the identified harm significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits arising from the additional housing provision. Councillor Bright sought clarification that nothing in the National Planning Policy Framework overruled that previous determination.

Mr Dixon said that the National Planning Policy Framework emphasised the need for housing but still allowed for that consideration. He stated that the site was in the preferred options for the potential upcoming revised Local Plan and whilst not adopted as of yet, that did carry weight.

Councillor Bright asked if the planning inspectorate's statement from the previous appeal decision should be given weight.

Mr Dixon responded that it should as it was a past consideration and the planning inspectorate was having regard to the physicality on what would be seen on the site and the impact on the character of the area which was a consideration. He stated that committee members had to balance that in their decision making as national policy was pushing for more housing.

Councillor Jackson said that he was pleased that Councillor Bright had quoted from the planning inspectorate's decision, and whilst the inspectorate might not have directly referred to the strategic gap, the fact that he had identified concerns about the impact on the countryside, he would suggest that's code for saying its invading into that green open space between Waltham and Scartho.

Councillor Jackson proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Lindley seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

The Chair asked Councillor Jackson and Councillor Lindley for their reasons for the proposal.

Councillor Lindley stated that there would be a narrowing of the strategic gap and the site was not an allocated site in the local plan.

Councillor Jackson stated that he would like the planning inspectorate's wording used from the appeal decision in December 2023 about the concerns of development in the open countryside.

Councillor Bright stated that the same wording should be used that the planning inspectorate had used.

Mr Dixon stated that, if members were minded to do so, they could rely on the Planning Inspectorate's findings regarding the intrusive impact of the development on the open countryside.

The committee took a vote and upon a vote, voted four for and five against the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Batson proposed that the application be approved with conditions.

Councillor Mayne seconded the proposal to approve the application with conditions.

The committee took a vote and upon a vote, voted 5 for and five against the proposal being approved with conditions. The Chair casted his vote against the proposal.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Jackson seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

The committee took a vote and upon a vote, five voted for and five voted against the proposal being refused. The Chair casted his vote against the proposal.

The Chair proposed that the application be deferred until the next Planning Committee meeting to allow committee members more time to consider the application.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to defer the application.

Councillor Jackson stated that he opposed the proposal to defer the application, as he was uncertain what would be achieved by doing so, other than the possibility that a different composition of members might be present on the committee when the matter was reconsidered.

Councillor Lindley said that he agreed with Councillor Jackson.

Councillor Goodwin asked if the application were to be deferred until October, would a new Local Plan be in operation by this time.

Mr Dixon stated that the next Planning Committee meeting would take place on the 30th September and that the Local Plan was being considered by Full Council on 24th September and if approved by Full Council, the

Local Plan would progress onto the Consultation 19 phase which would add more weight to any revised new Local Plan.

Councillor Bright asked if the new national scheme of delegation would impact the application being deferred.

Mr Dixon responded that there were two Planning Committee meetings before the scheme of delegation would be enforced.

Councillor Bright stated that he was not sure what would change if the application was deferred. He noted that officer's had confirmed that the planning inspectorate's previous appeal decision still holds weight with the new National Planning Policy Framework, and he would expect if another planning inspectorate looked at the application, they wouldn't change that so we should be able to make that decision confident that on appeal the conclusion would be the same.

Councillor Hudson stated that, unless members were prepared to change their position, the outcome would remain the same regardless of how many times the application was considered. He added that the Planning Committee meeting the following month might include different members who could bring a different perspective to the application.

Councillor Jackson stated that any new revised Local Plan had to go through Scrutiny, Cabinet and Full Council. He stated that committee members should not be predetermining their position assuming the particular site would be in a new revised Local Plan after Full Council on 24th September.

The Chair stated that committee members needed to focus on the current application and not get wrapped up in what would happen at Full Council regarding the Local Plan.

RESOLVED - That the application be deferred.

(Note - the committee voted 7 for 3 against for the application to be deferred.)

Councillor Emmerson returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 5 - DM/0301/24/FUL - Underground Water Pipeline Off South Marsh Road, Stallingborough.

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

Councillor Bright noted that after reading the objection from Stallingborough Parish Council the parish had asked for more information. As such, he wasn't sure why the application was before the Planning Committee.

Councillor Hudson stated that he was happy with the application.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved with conditions.

Councillor Kaczmarek seconded the proposal to approve the application with conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Kaczmarek left the meeting at this point.

Item 6 – DM/0390/26/FUL – 31B Humberston Avenue, Humberston.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report. Mr Limmer stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Bright stated that one of the objections outlined that no acoustic information had been provided about the pump system. He asked whether that information could be secured via a condition.

Mr Limmer responded that an additional condition could be added requiring that acoustic detail be provided.

Councillor Hudson stated that what was proposed was very minor and would not affect the neighbour. He stated that he had no issue with the application.

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

Councillor Bright seconded the proposal to approve the application with conditions and the additional condition.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 7 - DM/0888/25/FUL - Manor Farm, Church Lane, Irby Upon Humber.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received and an objection from Irby Upon Humber Parish Council. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report. Mr Limmer stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Bright stated that the site was outside the development boundary but as there were existing buildings there, he had no issue with that. He stated that one of the points raised by objectors was about the water supply capacity. Councillor Bright asked if a condition could be added regarding that to address concerns.

Mr Limmer said that Anglian Water had not objected to the application as the main water supplier. He referred committee members to policy 34 of the Local Plan. Mr Limmer stated that the developer had a right to connect to the water system and Anglian Water had not raised any objection to the application in terms of water capacity.

Councillor Bright said that he thought the concern was more about water pressure.

Mr Dixon reiterated that Anglian Water had raised no objection to the application and they had a duty to provide water. He said that they also have their own connection agreements.

Councillor Hudson said that what was proposed was probably the best way forward for the site. He asked how the buildings counted as self builds as they were six houses all joined together.

Mr Limmer responded that they would be sold separately and the works undertake for each plot would count as a self build.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved with conditions.

Councillor Jackson seconded the proposal to approve the application with conditions.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 8 - DM/0059/26/FUL - Tetney Road Service Station, Tetney Road, Humberston.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from the Ward Councillor, Councillor Dawkins. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed partial change of use of the site into a car wash would result in an over intensive use of the site resulting in unacceptable noise and disturbance, fumes and water spray to the detriment of residential amenity. He said that the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Ms Lister spoke on behalf of the applicant. She stated that the application related to an existing commercial site that has been operated for over fifty years as a petrol station, garage, MOT centre and vehicle sales centre. Ms Lister stated that a pre application had been submitted earlier in the year and they had been advised that planning permission would be required but that there were no obvious reasons why the application would not be supported. She further stated that what was proposed was not a proposal to introduce a completely new commercial activity into a quiet residential area. Ms Lister said that the site had operated as a vehicle related business for many years. She stated that the neighbouring bungalow was built after the garage was already established as a commercial site. Ms Lister noted that as small independent petrol filling stations had faced significant commercial challenges, it had been decided that the fuel tanks be removed. She further stated that using the site as a car wash facility would provide an alternative income stream helping to secure the future of the site. Ms Lister further noted that the petrol filling station which operated on the site generated high turnover short term visits typically taking three to four minutes per visit, whereas the car wash would have a lower turnover of vehicles with an average stay of twenty to thirty minutes. She stated that the car wash would be operated under the original canopy where the fuel pumps were previously operated. Ms Lister stated that from the canopy to the neighbour's boundary fence, there was a distance of seventeen metres and mist and droplets could travel one to two metres from where the vehicle was being washed. She said that they did not want the site to be empty as empty buildings become targets for vandalism and anti-social behaviour. Ms Lister stated that buildings were secured and maintained by occupation and use. She noted that the proposal would create employment opportunities for local people with the proposal expected to support two jobs with the potential for further employment as the business grows. Ms Lister advised that the proposal provided investment into the property and the opportunity to improve the appearance of the site. She stated that the car wash area would be properly managed and maintained helping to tidy and enhance the gateway on the edge of the village. Ms Lister said that modern car wash operations use controlled drainage systems and interceptors, and the proposal would be subject to planning and environmental regulations designed to protect surrounding land and water courses. She noted that for over twenty five years the business was operated by the same owner until his ill health and retirement two years ago. Ms Lister stated that since January, the business had been operated by a young entrepreneur who was keen to develop and grow the business and who had already

improved the appearance of the site. She concluded that the proposal supported an existing local business, helped secure the site's future, created jobs, improved the appearance of a long-established commercial site and would not fundamentally change the established character of the location.

Councillor Dawkins spoke as the Ward Councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He stated that he usually didn't call applications into Planning Committee and this was only his second call in, in a four-year period, which showed how strongly he felt about the application. Councillor Dawkins further referred to photos provided by the applicant which he showed how far the canopy was from the neighbouring building. He stated that the proposal was for a hand car wash, and that the site had sold petrol thereby creating fumes. Councillor Dawkins noted that the building was three hundred yards away from a building that was destroyed by anti-social behaviour due to kids using it since it had been demolished. He stated that he did not want to see that happen to this building. Councillor Dawkins said that the garage was a part of the community and offered repairs and the applicant was doing a fantastic job in turning the building around and it now looked a lot better. He stated that the garage was a compliment to the local area and something that should be kept. Councillor Dawkins further stated that the council constantly spoke of supporting local businesses and this was a local business that the council needed to support. He said that it was not a national company, it was local business operated by a guy who was trying to make his way and we needed to do everything we could to support him. Councillor Dawkins asked committee members to support the application, but if they didn't feel like they could support it he asked them to go on a site visit. He said that it was a simple ask to allow for a hand car wash and the fencing at the back was to make the site secure as the last thing we wanted to occur was anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Lindley said that the pictures of the site highlighted the situation and he didn't see any need for a site visit to take place. He said that the photos showed there was clear separation between the canopy of the garage and the neighbouring property. Councillor Lindley said that the garage was also functioning as a petrol station before the neighbouring house was there. He stated that the neighbours objection referred to unacceptable noise and fumes, but he thought that when it was a petrol station, there would have been more noise and certainly more fumes rather than what would be generated by what was proposed in the current application. Councillor Lindley said that seventeen metres of separation was more than enough and he didn't think any sprays would be able to go over that distance. He further stated that hand car washes were vital and existing hand car washes were well used in the borough. Councillor Lindley said that he couldn't see a reason to refuse the application. He reiterated that there was a good level of separation and he thought that if the application was refused, the building could fall into rack and ruin. Councillor Lindley said that he was minded to support the application but would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Bright said that he was in support of the application. He said however that he does not consider what might happen to the building if the application was not approved and instead considered the application as presented. Councillor Bright said that there was a seventeen metre separation distance between the canopy of the garage and the neighbouring property. He said that he found the officer's report interesting in comparison to the officer's report for the first application the Planning Committee considered at the meeting as that was able to be mitigated but was a lot closer to neighbouring properties but in their report for the current application, officer's state that the impacts were considered detrimental and it was not possible to mitigate the impacts through conditions, but there was a much larger separation distance for the current application. Councillor Bright said that he thought if mitigation was proposed for the first application to make that acceptable, then there should be some mitigation measures that could be put in place for the current application. He said that in this case, he didn't think mitigation was needed however due to the distance between the canopy of the garage and the neighbouring property. Councillor Bright stated that he had no problem with the application.

Councillor Jackson said that what was proposed was a very sympathetic use of an existing site. He said that there was a good level of separation between where the car wash would be located and where the neighbouring property was. Councillor Jackson said that he couldn't understand how what was proposed was sufficiently detrimental in order for there to be a recommendation to refuse the application. He stated that he would be supporting the application.

Councillor Goodwin proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley seconded the proposal to approve the application.

The Chair asked Councillor Goodwin and Councillor Lindley for their reasons for the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that there was plenty of room between the canopy of the garage and the neighbouring property, would bring building back into use and we have got to support local businesses.

Councillor Lindley said that there was a good separation distance and what was proposed was not an over intensification of the site. He said that the noise and fumes would be no different to what was on the site before.

Mr Dixon said that based on the comments made by Councillor Goodwin and Councillor Lindley, they felt that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on neighbours amenity due to the separation distance.

Mr Limmer outlined suggested conditions.

Councillor Goodwin and Councillor Lindley agreed with the conditions.

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.)

P.30 INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL SCHEME OF DELEGATION

The committee considered a report from the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure informing them of the need to make changes to the constitution in order to comply with the new national scheme of delegation, as required by legislation.

The committee discussed the contents of the report and expressed concerns about the new national scheme of delegation and its implications on local democracy.

Councillor Jackson said that it was important that parish councils be informed about the new national scheme of delegation as the changes would affect them. Mr Dixon confirmed that planning officer's had communicated with the parish councils.

The Chair proposed that a comment be passed onto Full Council that the Planning Committee were opposed to the new scheme of delegation as they believed that it was contrary to Central Government's expressed intentions regarding devolution and putting power into local hands. Councillor Hudson seconded the motion and the Planning Committee unanimously agreed with expressing their opposition to the new national scheme of delegation.

RESOLVED – That the Planning Committee's opposition to the new national scheme of delegation be communicated to Full Council.

P.31 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 24th July – 20th August 2026.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.32 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.33 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.34 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

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

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

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 1.00pm.

Minute of the Planning Committee 2nd September 2026

Item: 1

Application Number: DM/0631/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Torq Garage Scartho Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Demolish existing car wash, erect single storey extension to side of existing store with various associated works and alterations to create a bakery (including installation of extract and air conditioning units) and new fencing. Modification of jet wash booth and roof. Hours of operation remain 07:00 - 23:00 each day (Amended description, site and floor plans and elevations and documents and additional jet wash plan and elevation plan)

Applicant's Name and Address: Motor Fuel Limited C/O Agent	Agent's Name and Address: Jackie Ford JMS Planning and Development Ltd Build Studios 203 Westminster Bridge Road Lambeth London SE1 7FR
---	---

Deposited: 21st July 2025

Accepted: 31st July 2025

Expiry Date: 25th September 2025

Agreed Extension of Time Date:

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 Condition

The development shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved plans and specifications. Approved plan/ reports include:

2288-1 - Site Location Plan

2288-6-Rev G - Proposed Site Layout Plan

2288-8-Rev G - Proposed Site Elevations

2288-9-Rev G - Building Plan and Elevations

240401-01 Rev B - Proposed Jet Wash Area (Plans & Elevations)

A287AD.004 - Noise Impact Assessment by Infinity Acoustics

A287AD.004 - Noise Impact Assessment - Addendum by Infinity Acoustics

TS.2/6291/MT - Transport Statement by Bellamy Roberts

Greggs Main Extract Specification (Issue 1 2017)

Heritage Assessment by Historic Buildings Consultants

Delivery and Servicing Management Plan (Updated May 2026) by JMS Planning

Reason

To ensure the development is in accordance with the approved details and results in a satisfactory form of development.

3 Condition

No development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme for the provision of sustainable surface water drainage for the bakery and former car wash area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall be implemented before the bakery is first brought into use and retained thereafter.

Reason

To prevent an increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal and in accordance with Policies: 5 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

4 Condition

No development shall commence until:

(a) a scheme of landscaping showing the details of the number, species, sizes and planting positions of all trees and shrubs to be planted;

(b) a plan including details of all trees to be retained, any to be felled, hedgerows to be retained, any sections of hedgerow or trees to be removed;

(c) measures for the protection of trees and hedges during construction work have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of landscaping and tree planting approved by the Local Planning Authority shall be completed within a period of 12 months, beginning with the date on which development began or within such longer period as may be first

agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All planting shall be adequately maintained for 5 years, beginning with the date of completion of the scheme and during that period all losses shall be replaced during the next planting season.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory appearance and setting for the development and protection of existing features in the interests of local amenity and in accordance with Policies: 5, 22 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

5 Condition

External materials to be used in the construction of the development shall match the existing buildings, in colour and texture, as specified on the approved plan.

Reason

To ensure the development has an acceptable external appearance and is in keeping with the visual amenity and character of the area and maintains the significance of heritage assets within the area in accordance with Policies: 5, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

6 Condition

Within 2 months of the plant and extraction system becoming operational at the bakery, an independent BS4142 verification survey must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The survey:

- Must be undertaken during the 06:30 - 07:00 period, as this is the Noise Impact Assessment's critical window.
- Must measure LA90, LAeq and LMax at the nearest Noise Sensitive Receptors.
- Must confirm the rating levels against those predicted in the submitted Noise Impact Assessment.

Should the BS4142 verification survey show rating levels above those predicted within the Noise Impact Assessment, operations at the bakery shall cease between 06:30 and 07:00 each morning until a noise mitigation scheme and a scheme for implementation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved mitigation scheme has been implemented in full with a further verification report to confirm this in accordance with the approved timescales.

Reason

To ensure the modelled predictions (e.g., plant rating level 37 dB vs. 48 dB background) reflect real world performance and to maintain residential amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

- 7 Condition
No plant, mechanical equipment, or extract system related to the bakery shall operate:

- before 06:30 in morning and after 22:00 at night - Monday to Saturday
- before 08:30 in morning and after 20:00 at night - Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays

Reason

To ensure no creep occurs into the true night time period, where backgrounds fall even lower than 48 dB LA90 and to maintain residential amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

- 8 Condition
All noise control measures referenced in Section 4.0 of the Noise Impact Assessment must be installed at the bakery prior to occupation and shall be retained thereafter, including:

- AC units located exactly as shown.
- Silencer performance equal to or better than the RUCK EL 315 D2 01 specification.
- Extract termination at the modelled façade position.
- Any shielding or barriers included in the noise model.

Reason

To ensure the models assumptions are physically delivered and to maintain residential amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

- 9 Condition
The bakery hereby approved shall not open to the public outside of the following hours:

- 07:00 - 21:00 - Monday to Saturday and;
- 08:00 - 19:00 - Sundays and Bank/ Public Holidays.

The new jet wash facility shall not open to the public outside of the following hours:

- 08.00 - 20:00.

Reason

The use of the premises outside of these hours would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the area by virtue of noise and disturbance and in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

- 10 Condition
Deliveries, HGV movements, loading and unloading linked to the bakery shall not occur outside of the following hours:

07:00 - 21:00 - Mondays to Saturdays and;
08:00 - 19:00 - Sundays and Bank/ Public Holidays.

In addition, the bakery servicing shall accord with the delivery management plan submitted by JMS Planning.

Reason

Operation outside of these hours would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the area by virtue of noise and disturbance and in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

- 11 Condition
The new jet wash facility shall not operate within the following hours: Monday to Sunday inclusive - 20:00 to 08:00 the following day.

Reason

To maintain residential amenity and in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

- 12 Condition
No works related to the development hereby approved shall begin until a Demolition & Construction Management Plan (DCMP) including a Demolition & Construction Traffic Management Plan (DCTMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The DCMP & DCTMP should include, but not be limited to the following:

1. Contact details of the person with responsibility for the implementation of the DCMP/DCTMP;
2. The expected number, types and size of vehicles during the entire demolition and construction period;
3. The proposed daily hours of operation during the demolition and construction period;
4. Details of on-site parking provision for demolition and construction related vehicles;
5. Details of on-site storage areas for materials, if required;
6. Details of expected delivery schedules and how this will be managed to eliminate waiting on the public highway (i.e. call ahead or pre-booking scheduling system), if required;
7. Details of wheel washing facilities (locations, types etc.);
8. Measures to reduce noise and nuisance; and
9. Measures to reduce dust.

In addition, it should be confirmed that no fires will occur on site and no amplified music will be played during demolition and construction.

Once approved, the DCMP and DCTMP shall be adhered to at all times during demolition and construction works.

Reason

To ensure adequate access facilities are provided during construction, for highway safety and amenity reasons and in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

13 Condition

The extension housing the bakery shall be restricted to a bakery shop only and for no other purpose, including any other use falling within Class E of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended, (or any provision equivalent to that Class in any Statutory Instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), unless a further change of use is granted planning permission by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

The Local Planning Authority wishes to retain control of future changes of use to protect the amenities of nearby residents, highway safety and capacity and health considerations and in accordance with Policies: 5, 23, and 38 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

14 Condition

Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any statutory amendment thereto), no development under Schedule 2 Part 7, Class A shall be permitted in relation to the Class E (a) extension hereby approved.

Reason

To protect residential amenity, highway safety and the visual character of the area and in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the North east Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

15 Condition

No materials or equipment shall be stored outside of the bakery extension building except that waste materials may be stored in bins for periodic removal within the bin storage area as shown on drawing no. 2288-6 Rev G.

Before the extension is first brought into use details of the bin store and screening shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved scheme shall be installed and ready for use before the bakery first opens and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason

In the interests of residential amenity and in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

16 Condition

Prior to the bakery opening, final details of the spray booth design, based on drawing no. 240401-01 rev B, including exact height and dimensions and materials (including areas of opaque materials to roof and rear elevation) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be completed thereafter in accordance with the plans approved before the bakery is first brought into use and retained as such thereafter.

Reason

To maintain residential amenity and the visual character of the surrounding area in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018).

17 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.2 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity

gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:
i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is

undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any

arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

1 Reason for Approval

The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would, following amendment, not have unacceptable impacts on residential amenity, the character of the area, highway safety and the significance of heritage assets and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22, 23, 33, 34, 38, 39 and 41.

2 Added Value Statement

Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach

In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems, including issues in terms of dominance, over spray, noise and nuisance. Following negotiated amendments to the scheme a positive outcome has been able to be achieved sufficient to allow permission to be recommended.

3 Informative

Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).

4 Informative

Please note that the exemption in regards to BNG is based on the information provided, should any information change in relation to your proposal you are advised to contact the Local Planning Authority for advice.

5 Informative

Birds

All nesting birds are protected in law and any demolition/construction works close to existing trees/shrubs should be done outside of the active bird season, March to August inclusive. If this is unavoidable, then a nesting bird activity check needs to be carried out by a suitably qualified person immediately prior to any works. If nesting activity is present, no impactful works can be carried out until the young have fledged.

All common wild birds are protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Under this legislation it is an offence to:

- Kill, injure or take any wild bird
- Take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is in use or being built
- Take or destroy the egg of any wild bird

Certain rare breeding birds are listed on Schedule 1 of The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Under this legislation they are afforded the same protection as common wild birds and are also protected against disturbance whilst building a nest or on or near a nest containing eggs/unfledged young.

6 Informative

Please note the comments from Northern Powergrid in relation to the proximity of their assets and working practices.

Minute of the Planning Committee 2nd September 2026

Item: 2

Application Number: DM/0272/26/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Anthonys Bank Car Park Humberston North East
Lincolnshire

Proposal: Installation of height restriction barrier, pole mounted
Automated Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) parking
system, 2 pay machines, bollards and associated works

Applicant's Name and Address: C/O Agent Haven Leisure Limited Ltd. 2 Bond Court Leeds LS1 2JZ	Agent's Name and Address: Miss Naomi Parker Lichfields 2 Bond Court Leeds LS1 2JZ
---	---

Deposited: 14th April 2026

Accepted: 15th May 2026

Expiry Date: 10th July 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 4th September 2026

Case Officer: Mark Danforth

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Condition
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

Site Location Plan - TP/LD19/01
Proposed Site Plan - TP/LD19/02
Pay and Display and ANPR Details - TP/LD19/03 Rev C
Proposed Plans and Elevations - TP/LD19/04

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt in the interests of proper planning and in accordance with policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 3 Condition
The height restriction barrier hereby approved shall be open and not be restrictive in height between 0700 hours and 2200 hours on any day.

Reason

In the interests of access for all to support the recreational and tourism use of the area to accord to Policy 5 and 12 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032.

- 4 Biodiversity Net Gain;

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country

Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.2 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the

meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:
i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity

gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

1 Reason for Approval

The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm the area character including the adjacent Conservation Area or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 39, 41 and 42.

2 Added Value Statement

Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach

No problems have arisen during consideration of this application that have required working directly with the applicant to seek solutions.

3 Informative

The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments of the Environment Agency and that The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit or exemption to be obtained for any of the following activities:

- quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
- any activity within 8 metres of the bank of a main river, or 16 metres if it is a tidal main river
- any activity within 8 metres of any flood defence structure or culvert on a main river, or 16 metres on a tidal river
- any activity within 16 metres of a sea defence structure

For further guidance please visit Flood risk activities: environmental permits - GOV.UK or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03708 506 506.

Minute of the Planning Committee 2nd September 2026

Item: 3

Application Number: DM/0273/26/ADV

Application Type: Advertisement Consent

Application Site: Anthony's Bank Car Park Humberston North East
Lincolnshire

Proposal: Display 14 non illuminated pole mounted double sided signs
to include entry sign, tariff details and tariff reminder boards

Applicant's Name and Address: C/O Agent Haven Leisure Limited Ltd. 2 Bond Court Leeds LS1 2JZ	Agent's Name and Address: Miss Naomi Parker Lichfields 2 Bond Court Leeds LS1 2JZ
---	---

Deposited: 14th April 2026

Accepted: 15th May 2026

Expiry Date: 10th July 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 4th September 2026

Case Officer: Mark Danforth

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
This express consent shall expire 5 years from the date of the consent.

Reason
To comply with Regulation 14 of the Town & Country Planning (Control of
Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

- 2 Condition
- (i) No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.
 - (ii) No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to-
 - (a) endanger persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome (civil or military);
 - (b) obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air; or
 - (c) hinder the operation of any device used for the purpose of security or surveillance or for measuring the speed of any vehicle.
 - (iii) Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site.
 - (iv) Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public.
 - (v) Where an advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, the site shall be left in a condition that does not endanger the public or impair visual amenity.
 - (vi) The intensity of the illumination of the advertising unit permitted by this consent shall at all times accord with the thresholds set out in the Institute of Lighting Professionals publication "Brightness of Illuminated Advertisements" (PLG05:2015).

Reason

To comply with Regulation 14 of the Town & Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

- 3 Condition
- The adverts shall be displayed in accordance with the following plans:

Site Location Plan - TP/LD19/01

Proposed Site Plan - TP/LD19/02

Signage Detailed Elevations - TP/LD19/03 Rev C

Proposed Plans and Elevations - TP/LD19/04

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt in the interests of proper planning and in accordance with policy 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
- The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm visual amenity or public safety and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North

East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22 and 39.

2 Added Value Statement

Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach

No problems have arisen during consideration of this application that have required working directly with the applicant to seek solutions.

Minute of the Planning Committee 2nd September 2026

Item: 4

Application Number: DM/0907/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Land Off Woodland Way Grimsby Road Waltham North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erect a residential development of nine dwellings including public open space, access roads and associated infrastructure. (Amended Site Plan and House Types received July 2026)

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr Peter Strawson Idyllic Estates East Ravendale Farm East Ravendale North East Lincolnshire DN37 0RX	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Matt Deakins Ross Davy Associates Pelham House 1 Grosvenor Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0QH
--	---

Deposited: 21st October 2025

Accepted: 8th December 2025

Expiry Date: 2nd February 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 2nd October 2026

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Decision: Deferred

It was resolved that consideration of this application be deferred until the next planning committee meeting on 30th September 2026.

Minute of the Planning Committee 2nd September 2026

Item: 5

Application Number: DM/0301/24/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Underground Water Pipeline Off South Marsh Road
Stallingborough North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Installation of pump station with underground pipe work into adjacent fields with the erection of fencing, steps, handrail and associated works (HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT AND NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT REC 02-09-2025)

Applicant's Name and Address: NELC Municipal Offices Town Hall Square Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN31 1HU	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Richard Ashley NELC Municipal Offices Town Hall Square Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN31 1HU
---	--

Deposited: 20th March 2024

Accepted: 16th July 2024

Expiry Date: 15th October 2024

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 29th September 2025

Case Officer: Lauren Stinson

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Condition
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents:

Site Location Plan - HD040-100-CM-SC1 C
Plan View - RWC KMD 01
ISO View - Middle Drain Abstraction Headwall - RWC KMD 02
Middle Drain Side View - RWC KMD 03
Gas Pipe Cross Section - HD043-21 001
National Gas Pipe Cross Section - 001

Flood Risk Assessment - Received 16th July 2024
Planning Statement - Received 2nd August 2024
Design and Access Statement - Received 2nd August 2024
Noise Impact Assessment - C11266-1
Habitat Regulations Assessment - September 2023, Version 3
Construction Phase Plan - Received 9th January 2026
Design Risk Assessment/Hazard Identification Forms - Received 14th January 2026

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning in accordance with Policies 5, 7, 9, 22, 33, 34 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

- 3 Condition
The development shall be undertaken and monitored in accordance with the Habitat Regulations Assessment (dated September 2025, 3rd Version), the Noise Impact Assessment (ref: C11266-1) and Construction Phase Plan (received 9th January 2026) unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interest of ecological protection and amenity in accordance with Policies 5 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

- 4 Condition
No development shall take place until full details and a methodology of safe development in relation to the existing National Gas Transmission pipeline, in strict accordance with their specifications (T/SP/SSW/22 (Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Gas Transmission Pipelines)), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in strict accordance with the details approved.

Reason

In the interests of safety and infrastructure protection to accord with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

5 Condition

Should any works to the highway be necessary to facilitate the construction of the development, details shall be provided of how the highway will be reinstated and to what specification before such works take place. Once approved, works shall take place in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason

In the interests of highway safety and amenity and to accord with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

6 Condition

Prior to any construction commencing, a Landscape Ecological Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the approved scheme shall be adhered to at all times during the course of construction. All maintenance shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason

In the interests of ecology, landscaping and protecting the natural environment, in accordance with Policies 5 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

7 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development

to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:
i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity

Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would aid in providing benefits to the area and the Habitat Mitigation Site and would not harm the area character, amenity, and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 7, 9, 22, 33, 34 and 41.
- 2 Added Value Statement
Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by requesting additional information to overcome concerns.
- 3 Informative
The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that the requirements of the Party Wall Act may apply and you should seek advice from your agent or suitably qualified person.
- 4 Informative
Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).
- 5 Informative
The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments from:

- Council's Public Right of Way Officer
- Council's Drainage Officer
- Environment Agency
- Cadent Gas
- National Grid Electricity Transmission
- Northern Powergrid
- Highways Officer

Please go to www.nelincs.gov.uk to view the comments.

Minute of the Planning Committee 2nd September 2026

Item: 6

Application Number: DM/0390/26/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: 31B Humberston Avenue Humberston North East
Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect single storey front extension to house sprinkler system
equipment with associated works

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr And Mrs Bland 31B Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW	Agent's Name and Address: Mr David Hickinson David Hickinson Architecture Vba 2 Business Hive Chapel Court Brigg DN20 8JZ
--	--

Deposited: 1st June 2026

Accepted: 1st June 2026

Expiry Date: 27th July 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 4th September 2026

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development is approved and shall be completed in accordance with the
following plan:

Site Location Plan, Existing and Proposed Site Plans, Floor Plans and Elevations
- 856.25.02A

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt in the interests of proper planning and in accordance with Policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

2 Condition

The proposed development shall be completed using materials specified within the application form received on the 1st June 2026 and as stated on drawing no. 856.25.02A unless otherwise first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

This condition is imposed in the interests of design considerations in the context of the existing buildings in order to comply with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

3 Condition

Prior to installation, final details of the water pump, to include acoustic performance and attenuation, shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. It shall be implemented as approved and retained as approved thereafter.

Reason

In the interests of protecting residential amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

4 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or

developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.3 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006);

and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal does not and would not harm the area character or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42.
- 2 Informative
Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner by determining the application in a timely manner.
- 3 Informative
Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).

Minute of the Planning Committee 2nd September 2026

Item: 7

Application Number: DM/0888/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Manor Farm Church Lane Irby Upon Humber North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Partial demolition of existing outbuildings, extensions and alterations to create 6 residential dwellings, to include creation of first floor with roof lights to units 1,2,4 and 6. Access, parking areas, boundary treatments, installation of biodisc sewerage treatment plant and associated works - amended site plan and foul drainage detail April 2026 - Response to Anglian Water 18th May 26.

Applicant's Name and Address: James Ingestre Sir Richard Sutton Limited Benham Estate Office Newbury RG20 8LR	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Daniel Hyde Hyde Architecture Ltd 1 Westbrook Cottages Station Road North Thoresby DN36 5QS
---	---

Deposited: 17th October 2025

Accepted: 27th January 2026

Expiry Date: 24th March 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date:

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 Condition

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

1355-0001 Rev B - site location plan
1355-0002 Rev B - existing block plan
1355-0003 Rev C - proposed block plan
1355-0004 Rev D - proposed site plan
1355-0005 - building 1 existing plans and elevations
1355-0006 - building 2 existing plans and elevations
1355-0007 - building 1 proposed plans and elevations
1355-0008 Rev A - building 2 proposed plans
1355-0009 Rev A - building 2 proposed elevations

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3 Condition

No development shall commence until a scheme for the sustainable provision of surface and foul water drainage and a Drainage Maintenance Plan (that details how the drainage systems shall be managed and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage schemes shall be fully installed prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved Drainage Maintenance Plan.

Reason

To prevent an increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal in accordance with Policies 5 and 33 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

4 Condition

Development shall not begin until details of the materials and finish for all of the exterior works, including bricks, tiles, windows and doors in the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be built out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To ensure the development has an acceptable external appearance and is in keeping with the visual amenity and character of the area and the Conservation Area in accordance with Policies 5 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 5 Condition
Prior to the commencement of development full details of all boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the boundary treatments serving it have been fully installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To ensure the development has an acceptable external appearance and is in keeping with the visual amenity and character of the area and the Conservation Area in accordance with Policies 5 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 6 Condition
No development shall take place until the applicant has:

- (i) submitted a Written Scheme of Investigation or Specification for Works, for a programme of archaeological work, to the Local Planning Authority.
- (ii) received written approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation for a programme of archaeological work from the Local Planning Authority.
- (iii) implemented, or secured implementation of the Written Scheme of Investigation for a programme of archaeological work.

Use of the development shall not take place until the applicant has:

- (iv) published, or secured the publishing of the findings resulting from the programme of archaeological work within a suitable media.
- (v) deposited, or secured the deposition of the resulting archive from the programme of archaeological work with an appropriate organisation.

Reason

The site contains a Historic Environment Asset which requires recording prior to alteration or destruction to accord to Policy 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 7 Condition
No development shall commence until:

- (a) a scheme of landscaping showing the details of the number, species, sizes and planting positions of all trees and shrubs to be planted;
- (b) a plan including details of all trees to be retained, any to be felled, hedgerows to be retained, any sections of hedgerow or trees to be removed;
- (c) measures for the protection of trees and hedges during construction work;
- (d) a detailed plan for the management and maintenance of all the landscaping and shared areas on the site;
- (e) a detailed scheme for the implementation of the approved landscaping scheme.

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall then be built out with the approved tree protection measures in place throughout the construction phase of the development. The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully planted out in accordance with the approved details within 12 months of the first occupation of the development (or longer period as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and thereafter management and maintenance shall be in accordance with the approved Management and Maintenance Plan.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory appearance and setting for the development and protection of existing features in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy 5 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

8 Condition

Development shall not begin until details showing the location, layout, design and method of construction of any new or altered vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring space, including any necessary piping or culverting of any ditch or watercourse, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and before the development hereby permitted is brought into use the vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring space shall be constructed in accordance with those approved details and shall thereafter be so retained.

Reason

To ensure adequate parking and turning facilities are provided within the site for highway safety reason in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

9 Condition

Prior to the development commencing a detailed Construction and Demolition Management Plan (CMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details. As a minimum the CMP shall contain details of the following:

- Control of noise;
- Control of dust;
- Construction Traffic Management Plan;
- Working and delivery hours;
- Wheel washing facilities and implementation;

Reason

In the interest of protecting amenity and highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

10 Condition

Prior to development commencing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) based on the recommendations and advice in the submitted

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason

In the interests of ecological and biodiversity protection in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

11 Condition

Prior to the development commencing a detailed Biodiversity and Ecological Enhancement Plan (BEEP) based on the recommendations and advice in the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved BEEP shall be implemented in accordance with its terms prior to any dwelling being first occupied on the development and shall thereafter be so maintained.

Reason

In the interests of ecological and biodiversity protection and enhancement in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

12 Condition

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until conditions 13 to 15 have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until condition 16 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

Reason

In the interests of health and safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

13 Condition

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

- (i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
- (ii) an assessment of the potential risks to: human health, property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines

and pipes, adjoining land, groundwaters and surface waters, ecological systems, archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with the Environment Agency's Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) guidance, published online in 2020.

Reason

In the interests of health and safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

14 Condition

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Reason

In the interests of health and safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

15 Condition

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of health and safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

16 Condition

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of

condition 13, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 14, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 15.

Reason

In the interests of health and safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

17 Condition

The development shall consist of the conversion of the buildings only and demolition shall only take place in accordance with plan ref: 1355/0011 (demolition plan).

Reason

To ensure that the development is a conversion scheme and it retains the historic fabric of the site in accordance with Policy 5 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

18 Condition

Prior to occupation of any dwelling, final details of how water will be reused and recycled for each dwelling to ensure that usage is limited to 110 litres per person per day, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the details shall be adhered to at all times following occupation of the dwelling.

Reason

To ensure the efficient use of water and to accord with Policy 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

19 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the

Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.5 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or

more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:
i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;

ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and

iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that

the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

1 Reason for Approval

The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal would not harm the area character or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 39 and 41.

2 Added Value Statement

Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach

In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by seeking solutions to issues as they arose through the planning process.

- 3 Informative
This application will require the creation of new postal addresses. You are advised to contact the Street Naming & Numbering Team on 01472 323579 or via email at snn@nelincs.gov.uk to discuss the creation of new addresses.
- 4 Informative:
Where there may be the possibility of asbestos in the buildings the applicant, developer, and future occupier are reminded of the duties under Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012, or the more general duties under the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 in relation to any presence of asbestos in the building(s). The Health and Safety Executive can be contacted for further advice and a copy of the Approved Code of Practice is available from their website at <http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/l143.htm>
- 5 Informative
Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).

Minute of the Planning Committee 2nd September 2026

Item: 8

Application Number: DM/0059/26/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Tetney Road Service Station Tetney Road Humberston
North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Part change of use to existing car sales forecourt to include hand car wash and erection of palisade fence with gates to rear.

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr V Marchant 128 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SY	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Byron Smith By Design 47 The Avenue Healing Grimsby N E Lincolnshire DN41 7NA
---	--

Deposited: 23rd January 2026

Accepted: 13th March 2026

Expiry Date: 8th May 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 4th September 2026

Case Officer: Lauren Stinson

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Condition
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:
Site Location Plan and Existing Block Plan - 4002.01
Proposed Site Layout and Elevation - 4002.02B
- Reason
For the avoidance of doubt in the interests of proper planning and in accordance with Policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).
- 3 Condition
No hand car washing or selling of cars shall take place at the premises outside of the hours specified below:
Monday to Sunday 08:00hrs to 20:00hrs.
- Reason
In the interest of residential amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).
- 4 Condition
The water efficiency measures shall be implemented in accordance with the water usage details (received 28th May 2026 from Byron Smith), prior to use, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be retained thereafter.
- Reason
In the interests of efficient water management and to accord with Policies 5 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).
- 5 Condition
The vehicular access points, road markings, parking and manoeuvring spaces shall be implemented prior to use in accordance with drawing 4002.02B (Proposed Site Layout and Elevation) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The highways measures shall be retained thereafter.
- Reason
In the interests of highways safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).
- 6 Condition
All hand car wash activities shall only take place under the existing canopy as identified on drawing 4002.02B (Proposed Site Layout and Elevation).
- Reason
In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

7 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.2 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.
2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.
3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
 - (i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;

ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or

iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would use an existing commercial premise had having regard to the conditions imposed would not harm residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018), in particular Policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 38 and 41.
- 2 Added Value Statement
Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by requesting additional information to overcome concerns.
- 3 Informative
Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).
- 4 Informative
The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments received from Anglian Water and the Council's Highways Officer. Please go to www.nelincs.gov.uk to review.