



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 25th September 2025

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th July 2025 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (Chair)

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

Officers in attendance:

- Richard Limmer (Senior Town Planner)
- Jonathan Cadd (Senior Town Planner)
- Owen Toop (Town Planner)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Hannah Steer (Solicitor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Crofts (Immingham Ward Councillor)

There were 22 members of the public and one member of the press present.

P.10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Pettigrew declared a non-registerable interest in P.12 Item 6 DM/0191/25/PAAF as the applicant was his neighbour.

Councillor Kaczmarek stated that he had called in P.12 Item 8 DM/0349/25/ADV as residents had expressed their concerns to him, but he wanted to clarify that he was open minded about the application.

Mr Brockbank stated that he was a member of the gym which was the premise being considered under P.12 Item 2 DM/0259/25/FUL and he would therefore leave the room whilst the application was being considered.

P.12 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Item 1 - DM/0806/24/FUL - Land Adjacent To 9 Ashby Close And 19 Glenfield Road Grimsby

Ms Steer stated that a Definitive Map Order application had been received after the publication of the meeting's agenda and that it was appropriate to allow that application to be determined prior to the planning application being considered by the Planning Committee. Ms Steer said that she recommended the Planning Committee defer the application in order to allow for that.

Councillor Pettigrew proposed that the application be deferred to allow for the Definitive Map Order application to be determined. This was seconded by Councillor Mickleburgh.

RESOLVED - That the application be deferred.

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

Mr Brockbank left the meeting at this point.

Item 2 - DM/0259/25/FUL - Units 1-6 Block, 5 Kiln Lane, Stallingborough

Mr Limmer introduced the retrospective application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from a ward councillor. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Limmer stated that the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) had objected to the application on safety grounds due to the HSE zonings within the location. He explained that planning officers had engaged with the HSE on if there was any mitigation that could be put in place, but they had advised that there wasn't, and that the gym should be moved to another location. Mr Limmer stated that the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Tofton spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that he and his wife had ran the small family business since 2019 and he was present at the meeting requesting retrospective planning permission. Mr Tofton said that he had learnt through the process that the gym was not the actual cause of concern and it was actually the size that was, and if the premises were smaller, then the HSE would not have objected to the

application. Mr Tofton said that he understood the assumption that as the gym was large, that would therefore mean that there would be lots of people using it, but that was not the case. He stated that it was a membership only gym and he didn't want the gym to be overcrowded. Mr Tofton said that the reason for the expansion was not to allow for more members to join and use the facilities but was about providing better facilities. He said that the HSE had submitted comments on the 4th July stating that they had looked into it, but that was not true as the case did not have all of the details. Mr Tofton said that there was a system in place which monitored members activity. He said that there was around twenty-five to thirty people a day using the gym with an average of five members an hour. He said that those numbers fell well below the numbers that would be in an industrial building. Mr Tofton said that the building was 250 square metres, but he didn't understand why a small building would be fine, but a larger building with a few people using it was a risk. He stated that people were not able to just come and go as they pleased. Mr Tofton said that he had fire evacuations plans in place. He said that if his assumptions were right, then it showed that the HSE didn't value those working in big industrial buildings. Mr Tofton said that it was also wrong to advertise for other businesses to use the space, when he had been told he couldn't. He stated that one of the companies with the licence no longer operated and the other company with the licence, didn't have the facilities, but wouldn't give up the licence as it increased their value. Mr Tofton stated that his gym was a second home to some members and mental health was a huge issue in the area. He said that he wanted to provide an amazing service to the community. Mr Tofton asked the Planning Committee to approve the application so as to give the HSE the opportunity to assess the case with all of the information they hadn't seen.

Councillor Crofts spoke as Ward Councillor for the Immingham Ward. He said that he was speaking in support of the retrospective change of the use application for the premises to go from a warehouse to a gym. Councillor Crofts stated that the singular objection to the application was from a generic HSE form stating that both Global Shipping and Immingham Rail Freight were the inner zones, had a hazardous substance licence and that the warehouse was above 250 square metres; it didn't matter if the gym was partly or wholly within the inner zones. He said that both of the businesses no longer stored hazardous substances but were unwilling to relinquish their licences as that could affect any future property sale. Councillor Crofts said that as the warehouse was above 250 square metres, it therefore fell within the risk level two category which would always lead to the HSE recommending refusal for an application for a premise that the general public would use. He said that nowhere had it been outlined that when the premises operated as a warehouse, it had circa eighty employees exposed per hour all day. Councillor Crofts said that the gym would however have a maximum of 25 people exposed per hour which massively reduced the risk of exposure and the HSE stated that the probability of a major incident was small. He said that the recommendation from the HSE would change to 'do not advise against' if the gym was reduced in size or

if the applicant called the gym a warehouse for storage and repair of equipment. Councillor Crofts explained that the gym had evacuation procedures in place the same as the warehouse did and had controlled access. He said that many people were supportive of the application, and he thought that the council should encourage people to have a healthier lifestyle and also encourage small businesses to move to the area and stay in the area. Councillor Crofts stated that if the Planning Committee was to refuse the application, it would send the wrong message. He asked the Planning Committee to re-consider the recommendation of refusal and send the application back to the HSE to see if they wished to take the application to the Secretary of State to decide. Councillor Crofts said that he thought that the HSE should look at the boundaries, companies and exposure limits in the area. He said that it was important to keep small family businesses in North East Lincolnshire.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that nothing could ever be completely free of risk and that risk was a fact of life. He said that the premises used to be a warehouse, and whilst that was not a public facility, the applicant had said that the gym would not just be open to the general public and would instead be limited to members who he assumed would know all the relevant information. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that this was a classic case of red tape, and the Planning Committee needed to use their common sense. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright agreed with what other Councillors had said. He said that when he had looked at Google Maps for the area, there were other businesses nearby. Councillor Bright said that the modelling used by the HSE was simplistic and he thought that should they want to look at the application again in more detail, they would be able to as if approved, it would be deferred to them.

Mr Limmer said that there was a risk and due to it being within a level two area, that does then result in an objection from the HSE who recommend against approving the application. Mr Limmer sought clarification on the reasons for the proposal of approval.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that ordinary warehouses were allowed, and what was proposed was also going to be a closed organisation with just members permitted.

Councillor Hudson said that it was an absurdity that a slightly smaller building with more people using it could be allowed.

Councillor Kaczmarek asked if a condition could be added to the application regarding limiting the amount of people using the gym.

Mr Limmer responded that were the Planning Committee to approve the application, the application would then be deferred to the HSE who would then have the opportunity to go to the Secretary of State if they wanted to object further. Mr Limmer explained that if the HSE decided not to do so, then conditions would be looked at, including an occupancy condition.

Councillor Humphrey said that land use needed to be considered. He said that the licences might not be in use, but the zones were there.

Mr Limmer said that it was a land use planning matter and that the zones were there, and the licences could be in use tomorrow if wanted. He said that were the gym to have been applied for prior to the zones being installed, then the HSE would have been against the installation of the zones and therefore the licences due to the presence of the gym.

Councillor Humphrey said that it was important to consider that if a business with the licence wanted to use it, there would now be a gym there if approved and if another business wanted to apply for a licence, this application if approved could stop them. Councillor Humphrey stated that were the application to be approved, then it would go back to HSE for further consideration.

Councillor Shutt said that he had taken his time to consider the application. He said that you did hear about incidents with chemical factories and the HSE had provided a strong statement. Councillor Shutt said that on the other side, he took on board the comments from the applicant and the ward councillor who had provided details such as the numbers that would be using the gym and that it was partly in the zone and partly out of the zone. He said that he understood that Health and Safety had a black and white notion, but he wondered if there was any room for compromise. Councillor Shutt said that if a chemical company wanted to apply to be in this specific area, he assumed they wouldn't be able to if the gym was approved. He said that there needed to be compromise and he wanted to see the HSE consider the application in a proactive way. Councillor Shutt said that there needed to be mitigation in place, but he thought there was room for the gym in the area. He said that he didn't think he would be, but he was leaning towards supporting the proposal of approval which would allow the application to be deferred to the HSE to look at it again.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with Councillor Shutt and that the application should go back to the HSE with the additional information, that they weren't aware of.

Mr Limmer stated that if the Planning Committee did approve the application, it would then be deferred to the HSE and conditions would also be looked at including limiting the occupancy. Mr Limmer clarified that the entire premises were located within the zones, and it was not the case that part of the premises were within the zones and part were not.

Councillor Shutt asked if the companies with the licences would be consulted on the application.

Mr Limmer said that it was a land use issue, and the companies had permission to have the licences.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that it was important to be aware that the chemicals could appear overnight. He said that he would also want an evacuation plan to be added as a condition, one in the event of a fire and one regarding the chemicals.

Mr Limmer said that evacuation plans would also be looked at as conditions as well as limiting the occupancy and a management plan.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved and therefore deferred back to the HSE for re-consideration.

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

Mr Brockbank returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 3 – DM/0314/25/FUL – 3 Buddleia Close Healing

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

Mr Howard spoke in objection to the application. He said that he was speaking on behalf of residents who strongly believed that the proposed children's home was not in a suitable location. Mr Howard stated that he fully supported the need for facilities for vulnerable children. He said that there were concerns in relation to the congestion of parking and that there would be more vehicular movements than a standard home would cause. Mr Howard said that Buddleia Close was home to a lot of older families and this would change the dynamic of the area. He said that there were limited public transport links in the area and very little for children to do. Mr Howard said that the dwelling was also near a recently approved building site which could cause noise and disruption to the home. He said that there were also large vehicles using the area which presented a safety risk to children. Mr Howard said that the layout of the street was also very tight. He stated that there had also been a lack of public consultation, and many residents were not aware of what had been proposed hence the late objections to the application. Mr Howard asked the Planning Committee to listen to residents.

Ms Carrie spoke on behalf of the applicant for the application. She said that the application was not simply about bricks and water and was about providing vulnerable children with safe homes. Ms Carrie said that the proposed children's home would be a home for three children and would operate as a family home. She stated that no external changes were proposed, and the property blended into the area seamlessly. Ms Carrie said that the property was a four-bedroom detached house and as noted by the Highways Department, benefited from off street parking. She said that the Highways Department didn't expect the children's home would be any different to any other residential home. Ms Carrie stated that the application supported local policy. She said that concerns had been raised regarding anti-social behaviour, but this was unfounded, and the local police team were happy with the application. Ms Carrie said that each child living in the home would be carefully matched to the area and the home would be inspected by Ofsted. She said that the children's home would be held to the highest standard. Ms Carrie stated that there had been no objection to the application from the parish council. She said that as corporate parents, they wanted to create home in a supportive community for the children. Ms Carrie said that children in care deserved the same opportunities as other children and to be able to grow up in a safe environment. She asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he understood the concerns regarding consultation and that needed looking at. He said that it was important to remember that people were lucky to have two parents as not everybody had that. Councillor Mickleburgh said that children in care deserved the same opportunities as children that were not. He thought a lot of the objections were down to fear of the unknown and when a neighbour moved out, people were unsure about who would move into their neighbour's home. Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he didn't think people should presume and that the house would be home to three children at most, which could have happened anyway. He stated that he would be supporting the planning officer's recommendation. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that whenever there was an application for a children's home, objections were received. He said that before becoming a councillor, he would have shared the same concerns expressed by residents, but as a councillor he had visited some of the children's homes and they didn't have problems and operated as family homes. Councillor Hudson said that he didn't think residents would have the concerns once the children's home was there. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright agreed with Councillor Hudson but he did think parking could be a concern. He said that with staff working various shifts, it did seem like there would be more vehicular movements, but the Highways Department said there wouldn't be.

Mr Brockbank responded that there were three existing on-site parking spaces, with capacity for one further parking space to be formed on the driveway if deemed necessary, subject to highway access amendments. He said that there was also space within the carriageway of Buddleia Close and surrounding residential streets that could be utilised on the rare occasion the site generated surplus parking demand. Mr Brockbank stated that it was important to also note that not all staff would necessarily drive to work, they could cycle to work or also car share.

Councillor Bright asked whether it was reasonable to say that there would not be a difference in vehicular movements at the property. He said that there would be shift changes, and surely there would need to be handover.

Mr Brockbank said that highways officers didn't think there would be an issue as there were three off street parking spaces and spaces on the street.

Councillor Bright agreed with Councillor Hudson that there was also no evidence of anti-social behaviour. He said that he was leaning towards supporting the proposal of approval.

Councillor Shutt said that he had listened to the objector who had said that what was proposed was not a suitable location, but he would like people to therefore say where was a suitable location. He said that he understood the concerns about over intensification and parking, and it was a challenge, but we had to live with it, but the challenge was people didn't want to live with it. Councillor Shutt said that what was proposed was called a children's home, but it was also a home where children would be supported. He said that the children needed these homes.

Councillor Silvester said that he fully supported the application, and it would operate as a normal family home. He said that children's homes like the one proposed were located throughout the borough and there were no issues with them.

Councillor Emmerson said that it was the council's duty to provide care and facilities for the children. He said that sending children out of the borough was costly and we need to keep them in their local area, with our facilities and our staff. Councillor Emmerson said that it was a residential dwelling and people wouldn't notice it. He said that Healing was a busy place with businesses nearby, events and new builds.

Councillor Bright said that the point he was making regarding parking and vehicular movements, was that it would be a constant issue and not just once a year for an event like Healing Festival.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 4 – DM/0205/25/FUL – Agriculture Land, South View, Humberston

Mr Cadd 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 within the agenda papers. Mr Cadd stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr White spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that he was present at the meeting to represent a few of the plot holders. Mr White said that all of the plots were self builds and once people had bought their plots, they wanted to put their own stamp on it. He said that some of the proposed dwellings were now slightly larger, but forty percent of them had been substantially reduced. Mr White said that the paved areas would also be increased to keep the drainage scheme working. He said that he didn't think the parish council understood the current application and instead thought that what was proposed was for additional houses rather than to make amendments to already approved houses. Mr White said that a similar application in relation to one of the plots had been approved under delegated powers. He said that none of the plot holders had dramatically changed the design and what was instead proposed were minor changes, which shouldn't warrant the application coming before the Planning Committee. Mr White said that he had read the officers report within the agenda papers and that had covered everything. He stated that he didn't think those living on South View would see the development once completed. Mr White said that the construction workers didn't work weekends and residents had a direct contact number to him if they had any concerns. He said that he was expecting a further application to be submitted with plot one and plot five wanting to make some changes, with plot five wanting to remove the garage from the plans which he thought the parish council would probably object to. Mr White had tried to liaise with the parish council. He hoped the development would be completed within a year and he asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh agreed with the applicant that it was a shame that the application was before the Planning Committee. He said that the village council didn't seem to be against the proposed changes, but more against the principle of the development which had already been determined. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that he couldn't see why the application was before the Planning Committee. He said that he saw no reason to refuse the application.

Councillor Hudson said that the application being before the Planning Committee was an example of why parish councillors should do planning

training. He said that he did not see that what was proposed was over intensification.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 5 – DM/0107/25/FUL – 36 The Drive, Waltham

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

Mr Hodson spoke as the agent for the application. He thanked planning officers for their assistance. Mr Hodson said that he was pleased with the recommendation of approval. Mr Hodson explained that planning approval was granted in 1998, and it was the largest plot in Waltham at the time and possibly still was. He said that for a number of reasons nothing was ever developed. Mr Hodson said that the sizes of the proposed two plots were consistent with the area and in some cases were larger. He stated that the shape and the orientation was more conducive with a good design. Mr Hodson said that the applicant was keen to propose a contemporary design but also that both proposed houses had a familial design to Waltham village. He said that there were many examples of houses in Waltham with white render and white brickwork. Mr Hodson said that the applicant was happy with the planning conditions.

Councillor Mickleburgh felt that the application was straight forward. He said that the land was allocated for housing, and the proposed plot was of a good size. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he disagreed with the parish council and didn't think what was proposed was the overdevelopment of the plot. He also didn't agree with the reasoning that the proposed design was inappropriate, and he thought it would enhance Waltham. Councillor Pettigrew understood the concerns raised by neighbours regarding wildlife and biodiversity and hopefully condition twelve would help to allay those fears. He said that he was leaning towards supporting the proposal of approval.

Councillor Bright agreed with what had been said by other councillors. He didn't agree with the argument by the parish council regarding the design of the proposed development as he didn't think all houses needed

to be the same. Councillor Bright said that he saw no reason to object to the application.

Councillor Shutt agreed with what the other councillors had said. He said that the proposed development had good access, and he also liked the proposed design. Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Pettigrew left the meeting at this point.

Item 6 – DM/0191/25/PAAF - Moorhouse Farm, Brigsley Road, Ashby Cum Fenby

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Council. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Cadd stated that it was recommended that prior approval be granted.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. Mr Nelson felt that the parish council objection was weak. Mr Nelson said that the application was a Class R application, and the applicant wanted to move the store's furniture to a different location. He said that the retail unit would operate a booking only system. Mr Nelson said that the application had been amended following discussions with the Highways Department. He said that all of the issues had been considered, and the proposed scheme fully accorded with all of the planning considerations. Mr Nelson stated that the proposal was restricted to furniture and if the applicant wanted any changes, that would be subject to a further planning application. He asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson asked whether having Class R permitted development, meant that any agricultural building could be used to sell any product.

Mr Cadd responded that the Class R criteria was central government established criteria, and it meant that agricultural buildings could be used for retail purposes, but there were limitations.

Councillor Hudson asked whether the guidance allowed for officer interpretation.

Mr Cadd responded that the government guidance was clear.

Councillor Hudson asked whether we could now see more of these types of application.

Mr Cadd said that Class R permitted development allowed for agricultural buildings to be used for very specific use purposes known as flexible uses and that this application related to specific retail use and customers.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that the application being considered was not for a large retail establishment. He said that it did appear that parish councils were calling in applications and they didn't seem to always understand the planning matters. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Emmerson agreed with the concerns raised by Councillor Hudson. He found the idea behind the application random. Councillor Emmerson asked whether the width of the access would be suitable for larger vehicles.

Mr Brockbank responded that there was an alternative access that he assumed larger vehicles could use.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he didn't see anything wrong with the application and there were no technical objections to the application. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Humphrey said that there were businesses in the borough that had outgrown their facilities. He was supportive of what had been proposed. Councillor Humphrey said that Class R permitted development was an opportunity for businesses to develop.

Mr Cadd said that once an agricultural business reached 1000 square metres of flexible uses under Class R, the flexibility of Class R permitted development stopped.

Councillor Shutt said that there might be an increase in similar applications as there were businesses that needed more space. He was happy to support the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Pettigrew returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 7– DM/0302/25/FUL – Waltham Gateway Academy, Sunningdale, Waltham

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due an objection from Waltham

Parish Council. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Cadd stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that there had been compromises reached and he didn't think what was proposed would be detrimental to residents. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Pettigrew agreed with the parish council that it was not sensible for the construction work to take place on Sundays. However, he did think it was reasonable for internal works to take place on Saturdays. Councillor Pettigrew asked if there was a completion date for the works.

Mr Cadd responded that he understood the works were intended to be completed by the October half term.

Councillor Hudson thought it made to sense to increase the hours so the works could be completed.

Councillor Kaczmarek did have concerns about altering the previously agreed hours as it could set a precedent.

The Chair reminded committee members that all applications were determined on a case by case basis.

Councillor Kaczmarek was also concerned about the enforcement of the agreed hours and that whilst only internal work would be undertaken, there would still be lorries entering and exiting the site which would mean there was still a lot going on at the site.

Councillor Bright had no issue with the application and there had been no reported issues with the works so far. He saw no reason to refuse the application.

Mr Cadd was not aware of any issues with the construction work so far. He stated that the works proposed to be undertaken later on Saturdays would be internal works and the nature of those works, would mean that there was not going to be heavy lorries entering and exiting the site.

Councillor Humphrey seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

**Item 8 – DM/0349/25/ADV - New Clee Constitution Club,
179 Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes**

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

Mr Smith spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that the application would provide the football club with commercial revenue and due to ever increasing costs of running a football club, this was welcomed. Mr Smith said that he understood concerns about light pollution, but McDonalds nearby had a sign and there were also other premises which had illuminated signs. Mr Smith stated that they would follow the guidance.

Mr White spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that the conditions set were manageable, and the overview provided by Mr Limmer was more than accurate. Mr White said that they were surprised by the call in from the ward councillor as there were other illuminated signs in the area.

Councillor Mickleburgh asked how many hours the sign would be illuminated for each day.

Mr Limmer responded that the sign would be illuminated for 24 hours a day.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was slightly concerned about that and would like a condition limiting the hours of the sign being illuminated.

Councillor Silvester said that he thought condition two covered that.

Mr Limmer said that condition two outlined the level of illumination that was accepted as an industry standard and had been considered by the Environmental Health Team as acceptable.

Councillor Shutt said that he was no expert on the matter of illumination and thought it would be helpful in future to have some guidance on why some illuminating signs are recommended for approval and some for refusal.

Mr Limmer said that a lot of the time it came down to the level of illuminance. He said that most of the signs where there were concerns were ones with neon lights or flashing lights. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed illuminated sign was in compliance with the relevant guidance.

Councillor Mickleburgh queried how bright 300CDM squared was.

Mr Cadd said he couldn't provide a specific response to that question but that the Institute of Lightning Engineers had produced a guide which set out appropriate levels of illumination for differing types of environments

with the brightest levels being in town and city centres then grading down through various environments to open countryside.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it would be nice in the future to know what that level of lighting looked like.

Councillor Silvester asked whether the residents opposite had been consulted.

Mr Limmer responded that they had been and had not objected to the application.

Councillor Silvester proposed that the application be approved. This was seconded by Councillor Hudson.

Councillor Bright said that 300CDM squared was 300 candelas per square metre which was a unit of measure for luminance. He stated that he would support the application.

Councillor Humphrey asked if the applicant would have to apply for planning permission for the sign in five years' time as per condition one. He said that if there were problems, residents would go to the enforcement team.

Mr Limmer stated that the applicant would have to re-apply for planning permission in five years' time.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

P.13 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 30th May 2025 – 30th June 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.14 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.15 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.16 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

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

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

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 11.45am.