

Item 2 - R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue
Humberston - DM/0269/25/OUT



Humberston Village Council

Clerk to the Council – Mrs. K. Peers

[Tel:- 07494 577661](tel:07494577661)

Email:- clerk@humberstonvillagecouncil.com

Dear Sirs,

6th August 2025

The following planning applications were discussed at the meeting of Humberston Village Council held on Tuesday 5th August 2025 and the comments below each application listed are the comments resolved to be submitted as follows:

Planning Application Reference: DM/0269/25/OUT

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Location: r/o 33-35 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Objections - this application should be refused. Firstly the Village Council has a declared policy against any further 'infill' development along Humberston Avenue. Secondly, this proposal would result in a dramatic over-intensification of this plot which would have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties. Thirdly, the accesses proposed are unacceptable and unworkable. Finally, the Tree Officer has raised concerns on the number and siting of plots and would wish to see some removed, which the Village Council supports, and the VC would also point out that several trees and hedges etc. have already been removed on this site and it would query whether this has been done in contravention of any preservation orders on the site.

Yours faithfully,

**Mrs. K. Peers – Clerk to the Council
Humberston Village Council**



Humberston Village Council

Clerk to the Council – Mrs. K. Peers

[Tel:- 07494 577661](tel:07494577661)

Email:- clerk@humberstonvillagecouncil.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

7th January 2026

The following planning applications were discussed at the meeting of Humberston Village Council held on Tuesday 6th January 2026 and the comments below each application listed are the comments resolved to be submitted as follows:

Planning Application Reference: DM/0269/25/OUT

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of six dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Location: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston *Objections – the Village Council would support the objections of local residents on the grounds of:*

- *excessive over intensification of the proposed development, rendering it completely out of character with the area*
- *failure to meet N E Lincs guidelines on maximum number of dwellings to be served by an access road such as that proposed*
- *unresolved issues with sewerage as indicated by Anglian Water*

The Village Council would also wish N E Lincs to note their concern over the wilful destruction of a significant number of mature trees which has already taken place as witnessed by the Vice Chair of the Council

For these reasons the Village Council would wish to see this application refused.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs E Shawhulme – Vice Chair of the Council
Humberston Village Council



Humberston Village Council

Clerk to the Council – Mrs. K. Peers

[Tel:- 07494 577661](tel:07494577661)

Email:- clerk@humberstonvillagecouncil.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

4th March 2026

The following planning applications were discussed at the meeting of Humberston Village Council held on Tuesday 3rd March 2026 and the comments below each application listed are the comments resolved to be submitted as follows:

Planning Application Reference: DM/0269/25/OUT

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of four dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Location: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston

Objections. This proposal is against the stated policy of the Village Council that no further backyard or infill development should be allowed along Humberston Avenue without a thorough review of the infrastructure within the Village to support any additional housing. Also, The Council would support neighbouring properties with concerns over the detrimental impact of this proposal upon their privacy and overall aspect. A previous application for this site for 4 dwellings was refused by NELC on the detrimental impact on the site and this application should also be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. K. Peers – Clerk to the Council
Humberston Village Council

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Anthony Woods

Address: Humberston Avenue 25 Grimsby DN36 4SL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I write regarding the applicants response to my objection and would make the following point

After witnessing a transit van having to reverse from the shared driveway onto the main road, nearly resulting in an accident and causing a vehicle to take evasive action to avoid a collision.

My objection still stands.

Yours faithfully

A.W.Woods

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of six dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Anthony Woods

Address: 25 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I write in regards to the latest amended plans and wish to strongly object based on the grounds below;

The amended plans shows 6 dwellings to be served from a new single access point, whilst highway officers have no objections, what they fail to raise is a critical objection to the number of dwellings served off a private driveway.

NELC's highway design guide (July 2023) section 6 advice note specifically states that shared private drives can serve a maximum of 5 dwellings, the latest scheme is contrary to the design guide and should therefore be refused in its current form.

The amended plans now proposes 6 dwellings on a site area of 0.31 hectares, this is completely at odds with densities and character of the area around the application site.

Policy 5(A) of the local plan requires that developments are to be of a size, scale and density which is in harmony with the general character and appearance of the area. The scheme proposing 6 dwellings is a complete over intensification of the site and fails to comply with the criteria set out in policy 5.

Whilst I appreciate each planning application should be judged on its own merit, if development is to take place on this site it should be limited to a maximum of 3-4 dwellings as per proposals on other infill land along Humberston Avenue which have been granted planning permission.

The tree officer also objects to this scheme on the basis of plots 3 and 4 being located too close to

the rear site boundary trees which fall outside of the application site. To overcome this issue the site density should be reduced to provide more spacing around individual properties and separation distances from existing trees.

Due to Humberston Avenue already being extremely over developed and the material planning objections outlined above, the amended plans for 6 dwellings should be refused in its current form.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Anthony Woods

Address: 25 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I write to object to this planning application on the following grounds.

The scheme proposes two dwellings off the existing private driveway, the existing driveway does not comply with NELC's shared drive specification for the following reasons;

- The existing access does not achieve the required minimum of 5m for the first 6m from the rear of the highway. It only provides 4.8m and the width is further compromised due to an existing pillar close to the entrance.
- There is no dedicated bin collection point provided adjacent to the highway.
- The length of the driveway from the highway for the first 75m is at a width of 3.3m with no ability to provide additional passing places, this falls significantly short of the required minimum 4.1m to allow two vehicles to pass and for emergency vehicle access.
- The guidance states that passing places should be provided where the drive is greater than 18m in length. This is not achievable within the application site/applicants control.
- Vehicles entering the site from Humberston Avenue will have to reverse out onto a very busy footpath and highway if another vehicle is egressing the development site. This is due to the substandard driveway width at 3.3m and lack of the ability to provide passing places for the first 75m.
- The application is in conflict with policy 5-development Boundaries (B) access and traffic generation and should be refused on the highway grounds as existing access is not safe or compliant with NELC's highway design guide due to the inadequate width for additional residents, delivery and emergency vehicles.
- The scheme proposes 7 dwellings on a site area of 0.31 hectares which is totally at odds with the

densities and character of the area around the application site. A scheme of two or three dwellings would be more appropriate to the context of the site and surroundings.

- Policy 5 (A) of the local plan requires developments to be of a size, scale and density which is in harmony with the general character and appearance of the area. The current density of 7 dwellings fails to enhance the area and comply with the criteria of Policy 5.

- Policy 5(D) of the local plan assess the development impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, air quality, disturbance or visual intrusion. The scheme should be refused as it detrimentally compromises our residential amenity in terms of noise, disturbance and visual intrusion.

In conclusion the application should be refused on the grounds stated above

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Anthony Woods

Address: Humberston Avenue 25 Humberston Grimsby DN36 4SL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I write to object to this planning application on the following grounds.

The scheme proposes 2 dwellings off the existing private driveway.

The existing driveway does not comply with NELC's shared drive specification for the following reasons.

The existing access does not achieve the required minimum of 5m for the first 6m from the rear of the highway. It only provides 4.8m and the width is further compromised existing pillar close to the entrance.

There is no dedicated bin collection point provided adjacent to the highway

The length of the driveway from the highway for the first 75m

is at a width of 3.3m with no ability to provide additional passing places, This falls significantly short of the required minimum 4.1m

to allow 2 vehicles to pass and for emergency vehicle access.

The guidance states passing places should be provided where the drive is greater than 18m in length. This is not achievable

within the application site/applicants control.

Vehicles entering the site from Humberston Avenue will have to

reverse out onto a very busy footpath and highway if another vehicle is egressing the development site. This is due to the substandard driveway width at 3.3m and lack of the ability to provide passing places for the first 75m.

The application is in conflict with policy 5-development Boundaries (B) access and traffic generation and should be refused on the highway grounds as existing access is not safe or compliant with NELC's highway design guide due to the inadequate width for additional residents ,

delivery and emergency vehicles.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number : DM/0269/25/OUT

Address : R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue N.E.Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal : Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered.

Case Officer : Lauren Birkwood

Customer details

Names : Mr & Mrs J Pullan

Address : 27 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details : Neighbour

Stance : Customer objects to latest revised site plan

Comment Reasons :

Following the recent comments outlined by the Highways Authority on the revised plans, we are able as legal owners of the driveway to formally address some of the concerns raised.

We have no plans to remove the low level brick pillar, sign to 31b Jasmine house and any vegetation running the full length of the boundary fence. The vegetation is fully maintained and covers the original wooden fence therefore the removal of these is not within the applicants control.

The passing area shown in front of 27 Humberston Avenue is a private curtilage and entrance to our property which forms part of our title plans. (Copy available). No permission would be given to use this private area as a passing point.

The Highways authority concerns regarding the passing places and intensified use of this existing shared driveway is fully justified.

Evidence of reversing vehicles leaving the driveway onto the B1219 Humberston Avenue has been previously reported under neighbours comments.

We are now able to report that the raised area (15.5 Mtrs.) in front of 27 & 29 has been completed. (Photograph shown). This allows pedestrians the opportunity to use should any vehicle be blocking the driveway.

All Our original objections still remain

Mr & Mrs J Pullan



DM/0269/25/OUT - Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered, R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Comments from Mr & Mrs Pullan (27 Humberston Avenue)

We are in receipt of your most recent consultation letter and have reviewed the latest amended outline plan for 4 dwellings and strongly object to the scheme.

From a technical point of the view the current application is invalid and incomplete as the planning application forms still relates to 7 dwellings on the application site and not 4.

The red line boundary has also been increased beyond our rear boundary to the south. The existing site plan has not been updated to show this additional land. An accurate new plan needs to be provided including the location of the existing silver birch tree which is located right behind our property and provides an element of screening.

A group of silver birch trees where originally shown as to be retained to provide screening on earlier planning applications and most of them have been cut down. This one remaining tree should be retained within the development scheme to provide screening to our property and private garden area.

As you are fully aware a previous scheme for 4 dwellings, submitted under planning reference DM/0633/19/FUL, was refused under delegated powers. One of the fundamental issues was the site density which would be detrimental to the character of the area contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

Policy 5 (A) of the Local Plan is still relevant and requires developments to be of a size, scale and density which is appropriate to the general character and appearance of the area. The current density of 4 dwellings fails to enhance the character of the area and comply with the criteria of Policy 5.

Significant weight should be given to the refused planning application DM/0633/19/FUL in the current decision making process. Nothing has changed with

regard to the 2018 Development Plan which would now support a favourable recommendation.

The application forms states that the properties will be dormer style properties. Plots 1 and 2 are located very close to our rear boundary and we fear our residential amenity will be detrimentally compromised through overlooking from proposed first floor windows. This will affect both our private garden area and rooms within our property.

Therefore, we would request that the position of both Plots 1 and 2 are moved further east away from our boundary. We would also suggest no dormer windows are located within the rear elevations to mitigate direct overlooking. This should be secured via planning condition. Additional planning conditions should restrict the property heights to 1.5 storey only.

The latest outline plan shows the existing outbuildings on the northern boundary to be retained. We question the need to retain these buildings which are in a poor state of repair. We object to any vehicular access over our private roadway to access these buildings, if they are to be retained. We request that a new boundary fence be erected on the western boundary of plot 3 to prohibit vehicular access and thereafter retained.

In summary, the current outline scheme should be refused, if relevant conditions are not imposed as cited above to adequately protect our residential amenity.

Plots 1 and 2 should be moved more easterly as they currently detrimentally compromises our residential amenity that we currently enjoy and conflicts with Policy 5 of the NELC Local Plan, 2018.

We still feel very strongly that the concept of the scheme is an over intensive development of the site and this has already been tested through the previously refused planning application DM/0633/19/FUL.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number : DM/0269/25/OUT

Address : R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue N.E.Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal : Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered.

Case Officer : Lauren Birkwood

Customer details

Names : Mr & Mrs J Pullan

Address : 27 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details : Neighbour

Stance : Customer objects to planning application

Comment Reasons :

In response to the revised plan as owners of the private drive and guidance from the highways department. Under no circumstances can the areas in front of numbers 27, 29 and 31b be deemed as passing places which would be inconsiderate and unmanageable.

Please note other important issues with using the private driveway.

Humberside Fire & Rescue Service

The private driveway does not meet the requirements outlined in the letter from the Humberside Fire Service shown on the Planning portal. (Access for fire service)

Bin collection point (NELC Waste Services)

Three properties already use the end of the private driveway for bin collection, therefore no provisions have been agreed for further bins/caddies to be placed on the private drive.

Our original objections still remain

Mr & Mrs J Pullan

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of six dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr James pullan

Address: 27 Humberston Avenue, Humberston Grimsby DN364SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Based on the amended plans there are three fundamental issues that we wish to object to including the increase of the red line boundary of the application site behind our property.

Character

The scheme now proposes a reduction in numbers to 6 dwellings on a site area of 0.31 hectares. This scale of development is an over intensive development of the site and at odds with the spacious character of the area around this part of Humberston Avenue.

Your tree officer objects to the scheme on the basis of plot 3 and 4 being located too close to the rear site boundary trees, which fall outside the application site.

The site density needs to be reduced to provide better spacing around the individual properties and facilitate greater separation distances from the existing trees to the rear of the site.

A previous scheme for 4 dwellings was refused planning permission on the 7th October 2019 under planning application DM/0633/19/FUL on the following grounds.

1. The proposal would, by virtue of its density and layout, be detrimental to the character of the area contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).
2. The proposal would by virtue of its proximity, scale, orientation and overall design be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbours with particular regards to dominance, overlooking, noise and disturbance, contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan

2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

3. The proposal would, by reason of the access arrangements and layout, have a severely detrimental impact on highway safety and amenity contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

There have been no material changes in planning policy terms since the refused planning application. This scheme due to the higher density has a more detrimental impact upon the character of the area and for consistency should be refused.

Policy 5 (A) of the Local Plan requires developments to be of a size, scale and density which is in harmony with the general character and appearance of the area.

The current density of 6 dwellings fails to enhance the area and comply with the criteria of Policy 5.

Highways

The NELC Highway Design Guide July 2023 under section 6 advice note 'shared private drive' specifically states that shared private drives can serve a maximum number of 5 dwellings. The current scheme proposes 6 dwellings and is contrary to the design guide.

The application therefore in its current form should be refused on highway grounds due to the increased pressure on the highway network of Humberston Avenue, especially given the high volume of traffic already using the highway and potential road safety conflict with school children, pedestrians and cyclists.

The application is in conflict with Policy 5 - Development Boundaries (B) access and traffic generation and should be refused on highway grounds as the access is not compliant with the NELC's highway design guide.

Residential amenity

The revised plans fail to show the existing mature silver birch tree which is located to the rear of our property, within the application site. The retention of this tree would provide screening and for completeness should be show on the plans.

Whilst the scheme is an outline application scale is included as a detail to be considered at the outline stage. Dormer style properties are likely to be proposed and due to the very dense development it creates unacceptable layout due to the cramped nature of the site

The red line of the application site has been increased and plot 1 now sits very close to our rear boundary at around 9.5 m.

This will lead to a level of noise from the outside private amenity spaces of the plot 1 which will adversely affect our residential amenity beyond an acceptable level which we currently enjoy.

The proposed rear first windows to plot 1 fall short of the 21 m window to window ruling. In addition first floor rear windows will also look over our private garden area due to the very close proximity at around 9.5 m from our rear boundary.

The close proximity of plot 1 will create a detrimental massing impact. There is very little visual break in the building masses, when viewed from our rear property and will have a negative impact on our outlook from our property / rear garden area.

Policy 5 (D) of the Local Plan assess the development impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, air quality, disturbance or visual intrusion. The scheme should be refused as it detrimentally compromises our residential amenity in terms of noise, disturbance and visual intrusion.

The revised scheme conflicts with Policy 5 of the NELC Local Plan, 2018, specifically with regards to character of the area, residential amenity and highway safety and it is requested that the application is refused.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number : DM/0269/25/OUT

Address : R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue N.E.Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal : Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered.

Case Officer : Lauren Birkwood

Customer details

Names : Mr & Mrs J Pullan

Address : 27 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type : Neighbour

Stance : Customer objects to planning application

Comment Reasons :

As the owners of the private driveway we would like to register our strong objections to the above outline planning application on the following grounds.

The proposed plans show the use of the private driveway to access two properties.

This long narrow drive already provides access to three properties whose amenities will be severely impacted should it be allowed to be used by a further two more properties. Two vehicles cannot pass each other, so it follows reversing onto the busy Humberston Avenue could become a reality if such outline planning is approved. In the interest of safety and the homeowner's amenities, this long drive should not be allowed to become a common route for the occupants of the proposed development.

Highways guidance notes

The Highways guidance notes show the application falls short of the minimum 4.1 metres width. In addition, the existing access also does not achieve the required minimum width of 5 metres for the first 6 metres from the rear of the highway.

The length of the driveway from the highway is in the region of 75 metres at a width of 3.3 metres and therefore has no ability to provide passing places.

The Highways Authority recent comments on the Planning portal state they are unable to support the outline planning application in its current form.

Humberside Fire & Rescue Service

The private driveway does not meet the requirements outlined in the letter from the Humberside Fire Service shown on the Planning portal. (Access for fire service)

Bin collection point (NELC Waste Services)

Three properties already use the end of the private driveway for bin collection, therefore no provisions have been agreed for further bins/caddies to be placed on the private drive.

In summary

The proposal would, by virtue of its density, layout and highway safety be detrimental to the character of the area contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 – 2032 (Adopted 2018)

Mr & Mrs J Pullan

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Danielle Thomas

Address: 29 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Thank you for your comments, however my previous objections still stand for the below reasons;

The amended plans still show the passing point remaining immediately outside of my property, as previously stated the passing point is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass safely, pictures of this being attempted have been sent to the planning officer previously.

It is clear from the plans that in order for two vehicles to even attempt to pass that the vehicles need to be touching the boundary either side, one side is a fence and the other a brick wall / entrance to my property. The plans show two vehicles having to get extremely close to each other and leaves very little room to manoeuvre as the lane width from the fence to my brick gatepost sits at 4.4m, the width of my car as an example is 2.2m which shows how incredibly tight this is.

If there were to be two cars manoeuvring at the passing place attempting to pass, and for any reason I needed to exit my property in an emergency I should not have to wait for cars to manoeuvre backwards and forwards, which I fear would result in a collision before being able to exit my gateway. This would be detrimental to my property and as the owner I do not give permission for this to be used.

The new plans do also not change the fact that the length of the private driveway from the highway for the first 75m has no ability to provide a passing place, this conflicts with NELC's shared drive guidance which states that passing places should be provided where the drive is greater than 18m in length.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of six dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Danielle Thomas

Address: 29 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to strongly object to the amended plans on the grounds set out below;

Highways

The revised scheme now proposes 6 dwellings to be served off a single access point. Whilst your highway officers raise no objections to the technical layout of the scheme, what they fail to raise is a fundamental objection to the number of dwellings served off a private driveway.

Under Section 6 advice note 'Shared private drive' of NELC's highway design guide July 2023 it states that shared private drives can serve a maximum of 5 dwellings, these latest plans are contrary to the design guide.

The application therefore in its current form should be refused on highway grounds due to the increased pressure on the highway network of Humberston Avenue, especially given the high volume of traffic already using this highway.

This application is in conflict with Policy 5 - Development boundaries (B) access and traffic generation and should be refused on highway grounds as the access is not compliant with NELC's highway design guide.

Character

The scheme now proposes 6 dwellings on a site area of 0.31 hectares which is still at odds with densities and character of the surrounding area, the scheme is a complete over intensive

development of the site.

Your tree officer objected to the scheme on the basis of plots 3 and 4 being located too close to the rear site boundary trees, which fall outside the application site. Therefore, to address this fundamental concern the site density should be reduced to provide better spacing around the individual properties and separation distances from the existing trees.

A scheme of 4 properties would be more appropriate to the context of the site and its surroundings.

Policy 5 (A) of the local plan requires development to be of a size, scale and density which is in harmony with the general character and appearance of the area, the current density of 6 dwellings fails to enhance the area and comply with the criteria of policy 5.

Residential amenity

Whilst the scheme is an outline application, scale is included as a detail to be considered at the outline stage. Dormer style properties are proposed and due to the very dense development it creates an unacceptable layout due to the cramped nature of the site. A poor level of residential amenity is created to the proposed residents due to the close nature and proximity of the properties and overlooking between properties.

Plots 1 and 2 located along the western boundary sit very close to our existing boundaries at around 9.5m, the proposed rear first windows to plot 1 and 2 also appear to fall short of the 21m window to window ruling. In addition first floor rear windows will look over our private garden area due to the close proximity from our rear boundary.

The close proximity of plots 1 and 2 to our rear boundary (9.5m) also sprawl from north to south of our property which will create a detrimental massing impact as there would be very little visual break in the building masses, when viewed from the rear of our property. This will have a negative impact on our outlook from our property / garden area.

Due to the number of properties and close proximity this will lead to a level of noise from the outside private amenity space of the proposed dwellings which will adversely affect our residential amenity beyond an acceptable level which we currently enjoy.

Policy 5 (D) of the local plan assesses the developmental impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, air quality, disturbance or visual intrusion. The scheme should be refused as it detrimentally compromises our residential amenity in terms of noise, disturbance and visual intrusion.

Due to all of the material planning objections raised above, the revised outline plans should be

refused in its current form due to over intensive development of the site and on highway safety grounds, which all conflict with policy 5 of the NELC local plan, 2018.

To finish, when we purchased our property we had already accepted there would be 2 properties built on this site, we are therefore not against the site being developed however we are against the volume of properties under this latest scheme.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Danielle Thomas

Address: 29 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing in respect to the outline planning application to the rear of 33/35 Humberston Avenue and wish to strongly object based on the reasons set out below;

Character

The scheme proposes 7 dwellings on a site area of 0.31 hectares which is infill land, this is completely at odds with densities and character of the area surrounding the site. A scheme of 2 or 3 dwellings would be much more appropriate to the context of the site and its surroundings.

Policy 5(A) of the local plan requires that developments are to be of a size, scale and density which is in keeping with the general character and appearance of the area, the proposal of 7 dwellings fails to enhance the area and comply with the criteria of policy 5.

Residential amenity

Whilst the scheme is an outline application, scale is included as a detail to be considered at the outline stage. Dormer style properties have been proposed and due to the incredibly dense development it creates an unacceptable layout due to the cramped nature of the site, this will create a poor level of residential amenity to the proposed residents caused by the extremely close nature and proximity of the properties and overlooking between the properties.

Plots 1 to 4 situated along the western boundary sit extremely close to my existing boundary wall at around 7.5m and sprawl the entire length of the rear of my property covering every window which will create a detrimental massing impact. There is very little visual break in the building

masses when viewed from the rear of our property.

The proposed rear windows to plots 1 to 4 appear to fall short of the 21m window to window ruling, in addition first floor windows will also overlook our small private garden area due to the close proximity from our rear boundary wall which sits at a height of 1.9m.

Due to the number of properties and close proximity of the proposed development, it will result in an unacceptable level of noise from the outside private amenity space which will adversely affect our residential amenity beyond an acceptable level.

Policy 5(D) of the local plan assesses the developmental impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, disturbance and visual intrusion. The proposed scheme should be refused as it will detrimentally compromise our residential amenity in terms of noise, disturbance and visual intrusion.

Highways

The scheme proposes 2 dwellings off the existing private driveway, this existing driveway does not comply with NELC's shared drive specification for the following reasons;

It does not achieve the required minimum of 5m for the first 6m from the highway, the width is only 4.8m which is further compromised by an existing pillar close to the entrance.

The length of the private driveway from the highway for the first 75m is at a width of 3.3m with no passing places, this falls significantly short of the 4.1m minimum which is required in order for two vehicles to pass and for emergency vehicles to access.

Guidance states that passing places are required when a driveway is greater than 18m in length, this is not achievable and would result in vehicles accessing the site from Humberston Avenue having to reverse out onto a very busy footpath and highway if another vehicle is egressing the development site.

Due to all of the material planning objections raised above the outline application should be refused due to the over intensified development of the site and on the safety of the highway, which are all in conflict with Policy 5 of the NELC local plan 2018.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Danielle Thomas

Address: 29 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: After looking at the amended site plan, I would like to point out the passing place on the revised plan is my driveway and under no circumstances do I give permission for this to be used as a passing point.

All of my previous objection still remain.

Regards

Danielle Thomas

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of four dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Danielle Thomas

Address: 29 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: In response to your consultation letter, we wish to object to the latest planning application on the following grounds;

The application form still relates to a total of 7 dwellings and should be updated to reflect the amended outline plan.

The existing site plan is wrong and excludes the additional land to the south which has been added to the red line of the application site. This plan should be updated to show all existing features, include trees currently on the application site.

Character;

A previous scheme for 4 dwellings was refused planning permission on 7th October 2019 under planning application DM/0633/19/FUL on the following grounds;

1. The proposal would, by virtue of its density and layout be detrimental to the character of the area contrary to Policy 5 of the NELC Local plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018)
2. The proposal would, by virtue of its proximity, scale, orientation and overall design be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbours with particular regards to dominance, overlooking, noise and disturbance, contrary to Policy 5 of the NELC local plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018)
3. The proposal would, by reason of the access arrangements and layout, have a severely

detrimental impact on highway safety and amenity contract to Policy 5 of the NELC local plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018)

There have been no material changes in planning policy terms since the refused planning application on character grounds for 4 dwellings on the application site. Significant material weight should be given to that refused planning application in the current decision making process.

Policy 5 (A) of the local plan requires developments to be of a size, scale and density which are in harmony with the general character and appearance of the area. The current density of 4 dwellings fails to enhance the character of the area and comply with the criteria of policy 5.

Residential amenity;

Whilst we accept that the reduction from the original 7 dwellings to 4 is welcomed, we still have reservations on the impact upon the residential amenity that we currently enjoy.

Whilst the scheme is an outline application the scale confirms the properties will be 'dormer height' to minimise overlooking and maximise light.

The proximity of Plot 2 is very close to our boundary, concerns are raised regarding potential overlooking from first floor rear windows into our property. Therefore, we would request that the position of plot 2 is moved further east away from our boundary.

We would also suggest that no dormer windows are located within the rear elevation to mitigate direct overlooking. The issues around the property height being a maximum of 1.5 storeys and no rear dormers should be secured via planning conditions at this outline stage.

If planning committee are mindful to support the planning application, these conditions are reasonable and necessary to protect our residential amenity at the reserved matters application stage.

The current outline scheme should be refused, if relevant conditions are not imposed as cited above, and Plot 2 is not moved more easterly as it detrimentally compromises our residential amenity that we currently enjoy and conflicts with Policy 5 of the NELC local plan, 2018.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Ms Rachel Parkinson

Address: 31 B Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: While I appreciate the applicant's engagement with residents and their response to concerns, I remain strongly opposed to the proposal for the following reasons:

1. Access Road Limitations

The applicant mentions 'tracking analysis' has been carried out on the private driveway, which claims the entrance measures over 5 metres, this would appear to be at odds with the Council's own measurements who purported the road width to be 4.8 m and further compromised by the existing pillar close to the entrance?

Despite the disparity in figures, the reality is that significant sections of the access road narrow to approximately 3.3 metres, namely the length of driveway from the highway for the first 75 m is at a width of 3.3 m. This reduction in width - even if attributed to hedge overgrowth - materially impacts daily usability and safety. Regular maintenance cannot be relied upon to permanently ensure road clearance, especially as usage increases with additional dwellings.

Crucially, however, the NELC's shared drive guidance states passing places should be provided where the drive is greater than 18 m in length. There aren't any. The length of driveway from the highway for the first 75 m has no ability to provide passing places.

The highlighted 'confirmed' passing place next to No. 29 is a private driveway and, therefore, is outside of the applicant's control. It is also approx. 95 m from the highway.

Furthermore, the claim that vehicles can already "move freely in forward gear" does not reflect the experience of existing residents. The driveway is currently used by a limited number of homes; but

in this modern world where convenience and ease are paramount, I have, myself, witnessed delivery vans having to reverse onto the busy highway - as there is simply no-where else for them to go.

The addition of two new properties will significantly increase traffic, deliveries, and bin lorry movements. This raises real concerns over pedestrian and driver safety, congestion and emergency vehicle access.

The bin collection point in its current form, cannot accommodate space for wastage from an additional two homes without encroaching onto the public footpath. Furthermore, the length of driveway from the proposed new dwellings to the entrance of the private driveway also highlight a practical issue of moving bins to this location - especially in bad weather or for elderly/less mobile residents.

2. Overdevelopment

The reference to previous planning permissions being granted and including the approval and upgrade to 31B does not validate this proposal. Approving two new homes along the driveway is substantially different from home improvement renovations.

Each application must be considered on its own merits, and the cumulative impact of overdevelopment and safety, must be taken seriously.

3. Density for the area

The proposal's density of 22.5 dwellings per hectare may be "typical" in some urban settings, but it is inappropriate in this semi-rural location, which is characterised by generous plots and lower-density housing. Squeezing seven homes onto this site risks undermining the established character of the area (Policy 5 (A) of the Local Plan).

4. Detail on design and impact

While the applicant defers design concerns to the reserved matters stage, issues like overlooking, separation distances, and visual intrusion are fundamental planning considerations and must be addressed now.

Residents deserve transparency about how privacy, landscape character, and visual amenity will be preserved.

As already mentioned, the proposed rear first windows to plots 1 - 4 appear to fall short of the 21 m window to window ruling. In addition, first floor rear windows will also look over our private garden areas due to the very close proximity at around 7.5 m from our rear boundary.

5. Environmental and Ecological impact

Although a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Tree Survey have been submitted, these documents are only the first step. The proposed removal of trees and disturbance to local habitats

is concerning. A thorough Biodiversity Net Gain assessment should be required, and any mitigation (e.g. bat boxes, native planting) must be scrutinized and enforced through planning conditions.

It has also been noted that the Ecology Manager highlighted further considerations are required before the proposed works begin. An eDNA survey is required to be carried out on the pond within 250 m of the Site to ascertain the presence or likely absence of Great crested newts within the pond.

I have duly considered the applicants response, but the proposal, in its current form, represents overdevelopment that will place undue pressure on an already constrained private driveway. It would create risks around safety, privacy, and sustainability. Not to mention, alter the character of the area (Policy 5 of the NELC Local Plan, 2018).

My objection, therefore, remains.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Ms Rachel Parkinson

Address: 31 B Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to strongly object to the above mentioned planning application for the grounds set out below:

Highways

The scheme proposes 2 new dwellings off the existing private driveway, whereby my property is situated.

The suggested use of the existing private driveway for the 2 new dwellings does not comply with NELC's shared drive specification for the following reasons:

- The existing access does not achieve the required minimum of 5 m for the first 6 m from the rear of the highway. It only provides 4.8 m and the width is further compromised by the existing pillar close to the entrance.
- There is no dedicated bin collection point provided adjacent to the highway.
- The length of driveway from the highway for the first 75 m is at a width of 3.3 m with no ability to provide additional passing places. This falls significantly short of the required minimum of 4.1 m to allow 2 vehicles to pass and for emergency vehicle access.
- The guidance states passing places should be provided where the drive is greater than 18 m in length. This is not achievable within the application site / applicants control.
- Cars accessing the site from Humberston Avenue will have to reverse out onto a very busy footpath and highway if another vehicle is egressing the development site. This is due to the substandard driveway width at 3.3m and the lack of the ability to provide passing places for the first 75 m.

The application is in conflict with Policy 5 - Development Boundaries (B) access and traffic

generation and should be refused on highway grounds as the existing access is not safe or compliant with the NELC's highway design guide due to the inadequate width for additional residents, delivery and emergency vehicles.

Character

The scheme proposes 7 dwellings on a site area of 0.31 hectares which is totally at odds with densities and character of the area around the application site. A scheme of 2 or 3 dwellings would be more appropriate to the context of the site and to be in-keeping with the surroundings.

Policy 5 (A) of the Local Plan requires developments to be of a size, scale and density which is in harmony with the general character and appearance of the area. The current density of 7 dwellings fails to enhance the area and comply with the criteria of Policy 5.

Residential amenity

Whilst the scheme is an outline application, scale is included as a detail to be considered at the outline stage. Dormer style properties are proposed and due to the very dense development it creates unacceptable layout due to the cramped nature of the site. A poor level of residential amenity is created to the proposed residents due to the close nature and proximity of the properties and overlooking between properties.

Plots 1 to 4 located along the western boundary sit very close to our existing boundaries at around 7.5 m. Due to the number of properties and close proximity, this will lead to a level of noise and light from the outside private amenity spaces of the proposed dwellings which will adversely affect our residential amenity beyond an acceptable level which we currently enjoy.

The proposed rear first windows to plots 1 - 4 appear to fall short of the 21 m window to window ruling. In addition, first floor rear windows will also look over our private garden areas due to the very close proximity at around 7.5 m from our rear boundary.

The close proximity of plots 1 - 4 in terms of distance to the existing rear boundary and sprawl from north to south with built form will also create a detrimental massing impact. There is very little visual break in the building masses, when viewed from our rear property and will have a negative impact on our outlook from our property / rear garden area.

Policy 5 (D) of the Local Plan assess the development impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, air quality, disturbance or visual intrusion. The scheme should be refused as it detrimentally compromises our residential amenity in terms of noise, disturbance and visual intrusion.

There is also concerns regarding the impact of more properties on drainage and sewerage, especially if large trees are removed from the site, as the plans indicate.

Environmental/Biodiversity

Our garden and the immediate surrounding green space regularly support a range of important and protected wildlife species. Among these are muntjac deer, which have been frequent visitors to our garden for many years. The loss of wildlife will adversely affect our residential amenity beyond an acceptable level which we also currently enjoy. Not to mention, result in a long-term threat to biodiversity.

In conclusion, due to all the material planning objections raised above the outline application should be refused in its current form due to the over intensive development of the site and on highway safety grounds, which all conflict with Policy 5 of the NELC Local Plan, 2018.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of four dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Rachel Parkinson

Address: 31 B Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We are in receipt of your most recent consultation letter and have reviewed the latest amended outline plan for 4 dwellings and strongly object to the scheme. The reasons for this objection are set out below:

1. Invalid / Incomplete Application

The planning application forms continue to reference seven dwellings, not four, and the outline plans do not indicate the proposed dormer-style properties described in the application. This inconsistency renders the submission incomplete. We request corrected forms and accurate drawings before the application is determined.

2. Overdevelopment and Failure to Respect Spatial Pattern - Policy 5

A previous application for four dwellings (DM/0633/19/FUL) was refused due to excessive site density and harm to the character of the area. There have been no material changes in planning policy or site context since that refusal.

The surrounding area is characterised by:

- Generous plot widths and rear garden depths
- Consistent separation between dwellings
- An open, spacious suburban grain

In contrast, Plot 3 is only 3.5 metres from our boundary, (note plots 1 and 2 in the proposal are

situated approx. 13 metres from neighbouring boundaries), creating a visually cramped and inequitable relationship. This stark departure from the prevailing spatial pattern indicates the development is over-intensive, prioritising unit numbers over sensitive design.

Policy 5(A) of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2018) requires development to be of a size, scale and density appropriate to the general character and appearance of the area. The current layout fails this requirement, replicating the fundamental concerns of the previously refused scheme.

3. Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposed driveway and garage for Plot 3, running parallel to our rear boundary at a separation of 3.5 metres, will introduce regular vehicle movement, engine noise, pollution (from petrol/diesel vehicles) headlight glare, and general disturbance adjacent to our primary garden area.

Furthermore, concerns are raised regarding potential overlooking from first floor/side windows into our property and private garden. This will materially harm our residential amenity.

Therefore, should the application be approved, we request that conditions be imposed requiring:

- No dormer windows are located within the elevation to mitigate direct overlooking.
- Property height being a maximum of 1.5 storeys and no rear dormers should be secured via planning conditions at this outline stage.
- A 2-metre close-boarded acoustic fence.
- Appropriate boundary landscaping.
- Surfacing that minimises noise (e.g., tarmac rather than gravel)

These measures are necessary to mitigate harm to our amenity.

4. Overbearing Massing and Layout

Plots 3 and 4, together with the retention of existing outbuildings on the northern boundary, contribute to a cramped layout that is visually overbearing and over-intensive - eroding the openness that characterises neighbouring plots.

5. Conclusion

The amended outline scheme:

- Remains contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2018).
- Fails to protect residential amenity.
- Does not respect the established spatial pattern.

- Represents an over-intensive development already tested through DM/0633/19/FUL

In light of the above, we respectfully request that the application be refused, if relevant conditions are not imposed as cited above to adequately protect our residential amenity.

One important step to preserve the residential amenity we currently enjoy- and to align with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2018)- would be to remove Plot 4 entirely. This would allow Plot 3 to be repositioned further east, creating additional space to better accommodate Plots 1 and 2 without compromising neighbouring amenity.

We still feel very strongly that the concept of the scheme is an over intensive development of the site and this has already been tested through the previously refused planning application DM/0633/19/FUL.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of six dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Rachel Parkinson

Address: 31 B Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to strongly object to the amended plans for the reasons set out below. The proposal represents an over-intensive form of development which is contrary to the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2018), the NELC Highway Design Guide, and established planning principles.

Highways

The revised scheme proposes six dwellings served from a single shared private access. While the Highway Authority raises no objection to the technical layout of the access, the proposal fundamentally fails to comply with Section 6 - "Shared Private Drives" of the NELC Highway Design Guide (July 2023), which states that shared private drives should serve no more than five dwellings.

The proposal therefore directly conflicts with adopted highway guidance and results in an unacceptable intensification of use of a private access. This will place increased pressure on the local highway network.

The development is therefore contrary to Policy 5 (B) of the Local Plan, which requires development to ensure that access arrangements and traffic generation are safe, appropriate and compliant with adopted standards. As the access does not comply with the Highway Design Guide, the application should be refused on highway grounds.

Character, Density and Layout

The amended plans propose six dwellings on a site of approximately 0.31 hectares, resulting in a density and layout that is out of keeping with the prevailing character of the surrounding area.

Policy 5 (A) of the Local Plan requires development to be of a size, scale and density that is in harmony with the character and appearance of the area. The proposed level of development represents an over-intensive use of the site which fails to reflect the established pattern, spacing and openness of nearby development.

Furthermore, the Council's Tree Officer has raised objections to the proximity of plots 3 and 4 to trees located along the rear boundary, which lie outside the application site. This is a clear indication that the site layout is overly constrained. To resolve this fundamental issue, the overall site density must be reduced to allow appropriate spacing, root protection areas and long-term tree retention.

As submitted, the proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with Policy 5 (A).

Residential Amenity

Although the application is in outline, scale is a matter for consideration at this stage. The proposed dormer-style dwellings, combined with the very dense layout, result in a cramped form of development:

The proximity of the proposed dwellings to each other and to neighbouring boundaries creates:

- Unacceptable levels of overlooking
- Poor outlook and overbearing massing impacts
- A reduced level of privacy for both existing and future occupiers

Plots 2 and 3 are located approximately 4 metres from our rear boundary, which is wholly unacceptable. The proposed first-floor side windows to plot 3 also appear to fall short of the commonly applied 21-metre window-to-window separation distance, resulting in direct overlooking of our private garden.

In addition, the close north-to-south alignment of plots 2 and 3 along our boundary will create a continuous built mass with very limited visual relief, causing a significant adverse impact on outlook from our property and garden. The intensified layout will also result in increased noise and disturbance from private amenity spaces in close proximity to our boundary.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 5 (D) of the Local Plan, which seeks to protect neighbouring land uses from unacceptable levels of noise, disturbance, visual intrusion and loss of amenity.

Biodiversity and Protected Species

The site and surrounding area contain features capable of supporting wildlife, including green corridors and a pond within approximately 500 metres of the site.

Great crested newts are a European protected species, and where suitable habitat exists within

the vicinity of a development site, the Council's validation checklist and national standing advice require that the potential presence of protected species is appropriately assessed.

At present, the application does not demonstrate that the impact on biodiversity and protected species has been adequately considered or assessed. In the absence of sufficient ecological information, the Council cannot lawfully conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to protected species or biodiversity interests.

I am not opposed to the principle of development on this site. However, the amended plans represent an over-intensive form of development which fails to comply with:

- Policy 5 (A), (B) and (D) of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2018)
- The NELC Highway Design Guide (July 2023)
- Established residential amenity and design principles

For the reasons outlined above - particularly the non-compliant access arrangement, excessive density, harm to residential amenity and unresolved biodiversity concerns - the application should be refused in its current form.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Prince

Address: 37 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Reference: Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

We are writing to you in connection with the above outline planning application for 7 houses to the RO 33/35 Humberston. We are the immediate neighbours at 37 Humberston Avenue and will be negatively impacted by the development and have the following objections to the proposal:

1.

The proximity of three of the houses (plots 5, 6 and 7) to our boundary would mean a significant loss of privacy.

2.

We are extremely concerned about the impact to the environment that this would entail. The area has a diverse range of trees, shrubs, grass and plants which encourage wildlife and add to the biodiversity of the neighbourhood. This also helps to improve air quality and provides a beneficial outlook for all the surrounding neighbours.

Studying a satellite image of the existing plot shows clearly the extent and diversity of trees in and around the proposed development. The amenity of these to neighbours should not be overlooked. Looking further to the east one can see where back developments have reduced vegetation significantly.

3.

With reference to the arboricultural report, we are the owners of tree T13 (below), and, under no circumstances, would we be giving permission to remove it. We bought this property for many reasons, one of them being the size and diversity of the garden, and we do not want to lose any of

that or the amenity value of trees in the immediate vicinity, some of which have a TPO.

4.

We disagree strongly with findings of the NE Lincs Environment Protection Team stating, 'This unit has no objection to raise with regard to the outline proposals.'

The impact to the immediate environment will be entirely detrimental to the flora and fauna and local ecosystems, whilst also increasing levels of noise pollution. It will negatively impact every property bordering or overlooking the development. The development phase would create unacceptable noise and air pollution for surrounding properties.

5.

The erection of 7 houses would create problems in terms of safety and access. There is no provision for a pavement between Humberston Avenue and the development which would create hazards for pedestrians, including children and those with mobility aids/scooters. Access to the plot is via a single track which would be hazardous to all road users. Driving in and out of Humberston Avenue presents difficulties and danger to pedestrians and road users.

There does not appear to be adequate parking space for each household, given that the majority of households own 2 or more vehicles.

The so-called 'turning area' would not be adequate for emergency vehicles or even large vans. Bin lorries would find it impossible to travel the length of the development and turn. This would mean that bins would have to be left on the pavement at Humberston Avenue. 7 bins with the potential to block driveways and obstruct pavement users.

6.

The scale of the development is totally out of character with the visual aesthetic of the area. There has clearly been no thought given to this aspect. The close proximity of this number of houses in such a small area would lead to unacceptable noise levels for neighbouring properties and privacy would be severely compromised.

7.

There is also a potential issue concerning drainage, especially if large trees are removed from the site, as indicated on the plans. Trees contribute to ground drainage. Removal could potentially increase the risk of local flooding. There is also concern about the adverse impact on the sewerage system.

Having examined the previous 3 applications for development to the RO 33/35 Humberston Avenue, for one (2022), two (2016) and four houses (2019) which were all rejected, we fail to understand how this ill-considered application for 7 dwellings could possibly meet with planning approval.

We conclude by emphasising our strongest objections to this development.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of four dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Isabel Prince

Address: 37 Humberston Avenue Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:DM/0269/25/OUT|Outline planning application for the erection of four dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)|R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Please see below our response to the amended plans for DM/0269/25/OUT.

We refer you to our previous objections and consider that all of these are still relevant, although there has been a welcome reduction in the number of considered dwellings.

We would emphasise the following:

1. The objection from Anglian Water (20 Nov 2025) which we quoted in our last letter. The issues of waste water disposal and other matters in this communication have still not been addressed by the applicant.
2. The issue of surface water dispersal and possibility of flooding has not been addressed. In view of the recent heavy rainfall and Met Office predictions of wetter winters this has to be seriously considered. The underlying soil is clay and drainage of surface water very poor. Our garden to the north has been under water for the past 6 weeks as surface water cannot drain away. Building development will simply encourage further more extensive flooding of our property. We would also like to reiterate our concerns regarding the applicants claimed percolation tests. The applicant has not provided information to show that the tests were genuine. In view of this, the percolation tests should be disregarded as unsubstantiated.
3. Lack of provision of a pavement on the drive, as highlighted in our previous letter of objection, is a considerable concern.

4. As a previous application for 4 dwellings had been refused, we see no considerable difference in conditions that would facilitate acceptance of this application.

5. We repeat our strong objections on grounds of the proposed plan not being in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and environment.

Yours respectfully,
Paul and Isabel Prince

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of four dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - DRAINAGE - REC 23-04-26)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Prince

Address: 37 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This objection is in addition to our previous objections which are still valid.

The drawing Proposed Landscape Plans Drg. No. 05.362.25 dated 23/04/26 is not drawn to a recognisable or standard scale - 1:500 @A1 is insufficient for neighbours to measure distance to buildings and boundaries etc. The plan should be resubmitted with a correct linear bar scale so that accurate measurements can be taken and checked.

Regarding the 4 soakaways at each property. There is no percolation test data at each location to support the application. The outline planning application should not be approved until this data is available for professional and public examination. If percolation tests proved that soakaways would not work, the proposed development should be abandoned.

The underlying geology of the area is clay. It is extremely difficult to provide effective soakaways in clay unless they are significantly enlarged. Even then, the life expectancy of a soakaway is limited to 5 to 10 years. Once full, they would of course flood the surrounding plots and neighbouring properties.

The architect has used Mean (Avg) rainfall figures to calculate the size of the soakaway required. Given the rainfall over the last few months, it would be prudent to use the Max rainfall figure for the area. As calculated, they would underestimate the size of soakaway required.

The objection from Anglian Water regarding sewage connection to the main drain in Humberston Avenue still stands.

Our previous objections listed in Neighbours Comment - 37 Humberston Avenue of 02/03/2026 still stand.

Yours respectfully

Paul and Isabel Prince

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Prince

Address: 37 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We have read the latest comments on the planning portal regarding the above application.

We note the highways response regarding the unfeasibility of using the private drive leading to the rear of 33 Humberston Avenue where 2 of the proposed 7 house would be situated.

We now wish to re-emphasise our concerns regarding the proposed access which would run between 33 and 35 Humberston Avenue, and to confirm our objections to the type of development which has been outlined.

1. Although we note that Highways state they are satisfied with the proposed access widths of the shared driveway, we also note that they cite "typical delivery vehicles". We would point out that delivery vehicles can include large vans delivering furniture and other household goods which would find it difficult to access the site and pass other vehicles.

2. As regards the traffic of cars up and down this shared drive, the average car width today is 180.3 cm with larger SUV's approaching 200cms. These dimensions would mean passing on the shared driveway would be difficult.

3. The proposed plan also assumes 2 cars per household. In reality households these days are more likely to have more than 2 cars and perhaps one van if the owner has, for instance, a plumbing business, and has their own van. Is there sufficient parking planned at the houses to accommodate this number of vehicles. From experience of living on a road with multiple car ownership households and many delivery vehicles using the road, we know how tricky that can be,

and this was not on a single track, shared driveway, but a 2 lane road.

4. The issue of access to and from Humberston Avenue still remains. Even with the provision of a bin collection station, which has still to be approved, there is still the issue of cars joining this busy road, and possibly having to reverse out due to meeting traffic flow from the development. It would be impossible for larger lorries to back out onto Humberston avenue without causing serious safety issues, as the driver would have no view in either direction down Humberston Avenue until the cab of the vehicle was level with the pavement.

5. We repeat the issue of emergency vehicle access, and sufficient turning point, which remains to be fully investigated, as highlighted by the Highways Dept.

6. From our perspective at no. 37, we are very concerned about being overlooked and the extra noise factor from the number of houses proposed in this very small area.

7. Concerns over drainage are still relevant. The proposed 'rain gardens' are of concern. The question arises, when they are full, where does the overspill go?

8. While there is no metric for defining the aesthetic appeal of a development, this type of over development is clearly at odds with the size and design of the existing buildings in the neighbourhood and adds nothing to the local amenity.

With all due respect to the applicant, we remain strongly opposed to this development, which is so completely out of keeping with the area.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of six dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Isabel Prince

Address: 37 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:DM/0269/25/OUT|Outline planning application for the erection of six dwellings with access, landscaping and scale to be considered (AMENDED DESCRIPTION/PLANS)

In response to the amended plans for DM/0269/25/OUT please see below our further strong objections to this proposed development.

Anglian Water Comment dated 20 November

Section 3 - Used Water Network Anglian Water OBJECTS to any connection into our foul network from the proposed development, due to capacity constraints and pollution risk. In order to overcome our objection we require that the applicant consults Anglian Water in the form of a Pre-Development enquiry (PPE) in order to define a Sustainable Point of Connection (SPOC). This will avoid the constrained network which could cause pollution and flood risk downstream. The developer is to be responsible for the infrastructure to convey foul water flows from the proposed development to the receiving network. Once a SPOC has been identified and a strategy has been agreed with Anglian Water, we would expect the applicant to submit this PPE as part of their submitted documents for this application, we will then review and respond appropriately. Anglian Water is committed to supporting sustainable growth and in doing so we must continue to meet the statutory obligations whilst balancing factors such as climate change as environmental protection. However, if the LPA are minded to approve the application, despite our objection and risk of pollution, we recommend the following condition is applied: Condition: no development shall commence until a strategic foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority, in consultation with Anglian Water. This strategy will identify a sustainable point of connection to the public foul network. Prior to occupation, the foul water drainage works must have been carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: to protect water quality, prevent pollution and secure sustainable development having regard to paragraphs 7/8 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework. If permission is granted, we require the applicant to engage with us via our pre-development services and to submit a pre-development enquiry. The applicant can find further information regarding our pre-development services, including how to submit a pre-development enquiry, on our website: <https://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developing/planning--capacity/how-to-apply/>

The issue of sewerage has not been addressed in this amended proposal.

SOAKAWAYS / |SURFACE WATER

Surface water from six homes - The architect proposes 14 soakaways servicing 6 homes. When the soakaways become full, water will move laterally and saturate and ultimately flood the surrounding neighbours' gardens. Soakaways are typically used where individual buildings are 'off grid' generally one or two are sufficient. To have such a large number of soakaways - 14 as shown, in such a small plot is a recipe for flooding.

PERCOLATION TESTS

The site of the two percolation trial pits 1 & 2 , Ref - Site Location Plan, drawing 01.362.25 by R.F.L shows one to the north of the plot and one south 'mid' plot.

Trial percolation pits should be placed where the soakaway is to be located to test for local permeability. Trial pit 1 (mid plot) is under the access drive and trial pit 2 under the house plot 3. They are therefore NOT representative of the permeability where actual soakaways are indicated in the document 'Proposed Landscape Plan' drawing 04.362.25. This document is therefore insufficient and provides no evidence of compliance.

Percolation tests should be carried out by competent qualified experts in drainage and hydraulics. The applicant has simply presented a set of test results countersigned by the applicant's architect with no substantiating evidence to support the results.

There is no information on the engineers responsible for carrying out the test.

The date and time of the tests has not been specified. Neither has local ground conditions been assessed, commented on or local weather conditions. All affect the accuracy of test results.

There is no supporting time and date stamped photographs of the tests being performed. Qualified experts/consultants provide this as a matter of course as supporting evidence of compliance.

The results do not specify which British standard percolation test was applied.

There are no supporting calculations.

Unless this is an oversight, the applicant should present the unedited engineers report and results for public scrutiny not later than the 4th January so that all neighbours have a chance to scrutinise the data and make final comments. In the event that the applicant is unable to provide this information the document 'Percolation Test Result' is insufficient evidence of compliance.

TRACKING INFO

This does not consider parked cars in the drive which would prevent access to emergency vehicles. There is also no pavement along the drive for access to Humberston Avenue. As these small houses are likely to be purchased by first time buyers and those with young families the conflict between mothers with prams and pushchairs is obvious.

Finally, current regulations state that a private drive can only support 5 dwellings! On this basis alone, this application for 6 dwellings should obviously be declined.

Advice-Note-6-Shared-Private-Drive-AB.pdf

ALL of our previous objections still hold, and are reinforced by the above.

Paul and Isabel Prince
37 Humberston Avenue

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Prince

Address: 37 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Reference: Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

We are writing to you in connection with the above outline planning application for 7 houses to the RO 33/35 Humberston. We are the immediate neighbours at 37 Humberston Avenue and will be negatively impacted by the development and have the following objections to the proposal:

1.

The proximity of three of the houses (plots 5, 6 and 7) to our boundary would mean a significant loss of privacy.

2.

We are extremely concerned about the impact to the environment that this would entail. The area has a diverse range of trees, shrubs, grass and plants which encourage wildlife and add to the biodiversity of the neighbourhood. This also helps to improve air quality and provides a beneficial outlook for all the surrounding neighbours.

Studying a satellite image of the existing plot shows clearly the extent and diversity of trees in and around the proposed development. The amenity of these to neighbours should not be overlooked. Looking further to the east one can see where back developments have reduced vegetation significantly.

3.

With reference to the arboricultural report, we are the owners of tree T13 (below), and, under no circumstances, would we be giving permission to remove it. We bought this property for many reasons, one of them being the size and diversity of the garden, and we do not want to lose any of

that or the amenity value of trees in the immediate vicinity, some of which have a TPO.

4.

We disagree strongly with findings of the NE Lincs Environment Protection Team stating, 'This unit has no objection to raise with regard to the outline proposals.'

The impact to the immediate environment will be entirely detrimental to the flora and fauna and local ecosystems, whilst also increasing levels of noise pollution. It will negatively impact every property bordering or overlooking the development. The development phase would create unacceptable noise and air pollution for surrounding properties.

5.

The erection of 7 houses would create problems in terms of safety and access. There is no provision for a pavement between Humberston Avenue and the development which would create hazards for pedestrians, including children and those with mobility aids/scooters. Access to the plot is via a single track which would be hazardous to all road users. Driving in and out of Humberston Avenue presents difficulties and danger to pedestrians and road users.

There does not appear to be adequate parking space for each household, given that the majority of households own 2 or more vehicles.

The so-called 'turning area' would not be adequate for emergency vehicles or even large vans. Bin lorries would find it impossible to travel the length of the development and turn. This would mean that bins would have to be left on the pavement at Humberston Avenue. 7 bins with the potential to block driveways and obstruct pavement users.

6.

The scale of the development is totally out of character with the visual aesthetic of the area. There has clearly been no thought given to this aspect. The close proximity of this number of houses in such a small area would lead to unacceptable noise levels for neighbouring properties and privacy would be severely compromised.

7.

There is also a potential issue concerning drainage, especially if large trees are removed from the site, as indicated on the plans. Trees contribute to ground drainage. Removal could potentially increase the risk of local flooding. There is also concern about the adverse impact on the sewerage system.

Having examined the previous 3 applications for development to the RO 33/35 Humberston Avenue, for one (2022), two (2016) and four houses (2019) which were all rejected, we fail to understand how this ill-considered application for 7 dwellings could possibly meet with planning approval.

We conclude by emphasising our strongest objections to this development.

From: Isabel Prince

Sent: 23 July 2025 13:44

To: Lauren Birkwood (NELC) <Lauren.Birkwood@nelincs.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Planning - R/O 31-33 Humberston Avenue, Humberston - DM/0269/25/OUT

Dear Lauren,

Thank you for your email and forwarding the agent's response.

We have read the attached, and thank the agent for their response. As we find no further detailed evidence in this response to change our minds, we still stand by all our objections.

Regards.

Isabel and Paul Prince

37 Humberston Avenue

From: Angela Phillips

Sent: 08 August 2025 17:02

To: Lauren Birkwood (NELC)

Subject: Re: Planning - R/O 31-33 Humberston Avenue, Humberston - DM/0269/25/OUT

thank you for your reply -

in regards to their comment re “not adjacent to number 39” - I would state that the new development from proposed upper windows would be looking into my rear garden, of which i have had privacy for nearly 20 years - plus the noise from several new homes would be disruptive so close to not only my property but those adjoint -

The number of mature trees intended to be removed in this application (even though the applicant states they would plant new tress,) the proposed new saplings would not mature for many years to provide the continued habitat enjoyed currently by the wild birds etc -

The whole drainage system in this area, has not been increased/improved despite the increase in properties using it - flooding is frequent, back up of sewage common - and having spoken with Anglian Water there are no plans to improve -

kind regards

Angela Phillips

39 Humberston Ave

From: Angela Phillips
Sent: 14 July 2025 11:47
To: Planning - IGE (Equans) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>

14/07/2025

NEC Planning
Municipal Offices
Town Hall Square
Grimsby DN311HU

f.a.o. Lauren Birkwood - Senior Town Planner

Ref planning application DM/0269/25/OUT

Dear Ms Birkwood,

I write in respect of the above planning application to lodge my objection in this matter, and below are my said objection as near neighbour

1. Loss of privacy - overlooking my garden/premises - impact on my privacy - the noise level from these proposed properties would invade any privacy and peaceful setting I have had living in my home for over 17 years -
2. The trees/bushes/shrubs and grass areas - destruction and removal of aforesaid would have a severe detrimental effect on the wild life currently found in said area
3. I disagree with the findings of the Lincs Environment Protection Team - in that they state "no objection to raise with regard to outline proposals" - as it most certainly would if, permission were to be granted - re wild life - air pollution - plus the disturbance of 7 new properties re construction of same.
4. The proposed entrance/drive way is certainly not suitable re danger to pedestrians from cars entering and leaving proposed development - "single track" - nor suitable should emergency vehicles - i.e. ambulance/fire engines /bin collection lorries etc be required to attend said development.
5. As stated on proposed plan there is inadequate parking spaces provided for each proposed house and shows a T style turning point to be used by all 7 proposed houses - not sufficient safety wise.
6. The drainage in this area has always had issues in the last few years - current main drains struggle to already cope with sewage/rain water/household waste waters and has not been updated to account for the already increased amounts of property in this said area -

In conclusion, Mr Kashor has previous applications for development to the rear of 33/35 Humberston Ave (1 house 2022)

(2 houses 2016) and then 4 houses 2019 - which were all denied! Therefore I cannot understand why now an application for 7 houses could possibly meet with planning permission?

Therefore I strongly object to this application.

Yours sincerely

Angela Phillips (Mrs)
39 Humberston Ave
Grimsby
DN36 4SW

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Lisa Walker

Address: 39A Humberston Avenue Humberston DN36 4SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: It's an over-development of the site, which is not in-keeping to the surrounding area to Humberston Avenue. Residential amenity would be negatively affected by this development. The existing property, number 35, which fronts to Humberston Avenue would have its amenity negatively impacted due to losing an unacceptable amount of frontage. As this imposing, heritage property sits to Humberston Avenue itself there is a direct and negative visual impact to 35 and therefore upon the character of the Avenue.

The design in relation to plots 4 and 5 negatively impact pine trees as highlighted by the Trees and Woodland officer.

There are access and safety concerns as raised by Highways and other residents living in close proximity.

Humberside Fire & Rescue have also raised a number of concerns.

From: Lisa Walker
Sent: 13 January 2026 13:35
To: Planning - IGE <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application DM/0269/25/OUT

To whom it may concern

Please see my opposal for the above planning application. I hope it will be taken into consideration as I have only just returned from visiting family on 12th January for the Christmas period, therefore missing the 6th January cut off date.

For the att of the planning case worker in relation to application DM/0269/25/OUT, R/O [33-35 Humberston Avenue, Humberston, DN36 4SW](#)

Objection to revised plan

Having had an opportunity to view the amended plan, which now involves six properties to the rear garden land; I believe this proposal is an over-development and not in keeping with the surrounding area and character to Humberston Avenue.

As mentioned already the plots are to rear garden land and unfortunately what is being proposed by this applicant involves a development of houses. This is not in-keeping to my one storey property or other similar one storey properties near to mine all on rear garden land. From my perspective this makes the proposed development out of character with regard to other rear garden developments to this section of Humberston Avenue. Allowing houses on this plot creates dominance and overbearing for nearby neighbours.

Given the limitations of the proposed access road, I believe the addition of six properties (with a minimum of 12 vehicles) is totally inappropriate and would be unsafe and unworkable in practice with the risk of vehicles exiting the access road in reverse gear.

I am concerned plots 3 and 4 will encroach upon the Pine Trees subjected to TPOs. I understand similar requests have been resisted by the Authority and believe in the interests of parity and fairness the same should apply here. Allowing developments to extend over the existing building line would set a negative precedent and give a green light to other developers seeking to do the same. The pine trees are splendid examples and warrant protection.

I also seek assurance that the turning area is sufficient for a full size fire engine to be able to adequately turn on site (Approved Document B). Without the necessary minimum requirements being in place, 16.8m between

kerbs and 19.2m between walls, I feel there would be a risk of a service engine being unable to exit the access road in forward gear.

Given the concerns I have I would like to confirm I object to the revised plan accordingly.

Yours sincerely

Lisa walker

39A Humberston Avenue
Humberston
Grimsby

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Suzanne Clark

Address: 2 The Glade New Waltham Grimsby DN36 4FS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:1. We reside on the Glade and are extremely concerned about the impact to the environment that this would entail. The area

has a diverse range of trees, shrubs, grass and plants which encourage wildlife and add to the biodiversity of the neighbourhood. This also helps to improve air quality and provides a beneficial outlook for all the surrounding neighbours.

Studying a satellite image of the existing plot shows clearly the extent and diversity of trees in and around the proposed development.

2. We brought our property for a range of reasons, one being the range of wildlife to the rear of the property including deer. We feel the proposals would see a significant decline to the amount of wildlife and severely affect their wellbeing.

3. We feel that this development would have huge impact to the immediate environment and be entirely detrimental to the flora and fauna and local ecosystems, whilst also increasing levels of noise pollution. It will negatively impact every property bordering or overlooking the development. The development phase would create unacceptable noise and air pollution for surrounding properties.

3. Humberstone Avenue is already overrun with traffic and several building sites and we are concerned that one road cannot sustain this level of activity. I drive down this road on a daily basis to take my children to and from school and am often concerned by the sheer level of traffic from traffic caused by new buildings appearing everywhere and for the safety of those travelling in cars and small children on bikes. The development will only add to this and create further unwanted lorries and traffic.

4. The so-called 'turning area' would not be adequate for emergency vehicles or even large vans.

Bin

lorries would find it impossible to travel the length of the development and turn. This would mean that bins would have to be left on the pavement at Humberston Avenue. 7 bins with the potential to block driveways and obstruct pavement users. This is already a huge issue on Humberstone Avenue and again pedestrians and young children on bikes often find the pavements obstructed and further bins would make it even harder for those to pass and get through safely.

5. There is also a potential issue concerning drainage, especially if large trees are removed from the

site, as indicated on the plans. Trees contribute to ground drainage. Removal could potentially increase the risk of local flooding. There is also concern about the adverse impact on the sewerage system.

6. Having examined the previous 3 applications for development to the RO 33/35 Humberston Avenue, for one (2022), two (2016) and four houses (2019) which were all rejected, we fail like others to

understand how this ill-considered application for 7 dwellings could possibly meet with planning approval.

I would like to emphasise our strongest objections to this development.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Barry Hancock

Address: The Limes Antons Gowt Boston PE22 7BG

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

Dear Lauren Birkwood

Swifts, a migrant bird from South Africa come here every year to breed in the roof space of our houses. In recent years, access to roof space has been blocked off through roof repair, renovation or sometimes house demolition. This has led to a dramatic decline of 60% in the last 20 years. As a result, swifts are now red listed and in serious danger of extinction.

Ensuring provision is made for swifts via the planning system is crucial, so anything you can do to encourage developers and applicants to incorporate swift bricks into building plans would be very valuable. The bricks are easy to fit, inexpensive, unobtrusive, will cater for other red listed species like house sparrow, house martin and starling, and will last the lifetime of the building. It should be noted that the NPPF says that policies should incorporate features like swift nesting bricks.

Three swift nesting bricks used here per house for this colonial nesting species would be ideal. I am very happy to provide further information if it would be helpful, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours sincerely

Barry Hancock - swift survival worker

The Limes
Antons Gowt
Boston
PE22 7BG

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Alora Pungi

Address: 33 humberston avenue Humberston DN364SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

I've lived on Humberston Avenue for over 20 years and know the area and its changes very well. I'd like to express my support for the proposed development of seven dormer-style bungalows to the rear of 33 and 35 Humberston Avenue.

I am connected to part of the land involved in the development through ownership, but I would not be supporting this application if I thought it would cause harm to the area or to my own property. My support is based on what I believe is a carefully thought-out and respectful proposal.

What stands out to me is the scale and design of the development. Unlike some of the larger, more imposing houses that have been built along Humberston Avenue, this plan uses modest, well-spaced dormer bungalows that feel much more in keeping with a quiet residential setting. The design seems ideally suited to couples or people in later life - less noise, fewer vehicles, and a more peaceful cul-de-sac atmosphere.

It feels homely, appropriate, and well-integrated into the existing surroundings. The access arrangements have also clearly been considered, with a layout that avoids overdevelopment or strain on the local area. In addition, it's clear that the existing trees and landscaping have been taken into account as part of the design, which I think is important and has been handled sensitively.

This development directly affects my property - both at the front and rear - and I genuinely have no objections. I believe it will sit comfortably behind our home and contribute positively to the area overall.

In my view, this is a calm, low-impact proposal that will sit well at the rear of these plots and be a welcome addition to the neighbourhood.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0269/25/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0269/25/OUT

Address: R/O 33-35 Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of 7 detached properties, with access, landscaping and scale to be considered

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Liam Pungi

Address: 35 humberston avenue Humberston DN364SW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

As the owner of 35 Humberston Avenue, I'm writing in support of the proposed development of seven dormer bungalows to the rear of the property.

I've lived here for only a few years, but it's clear that many other properties along this part of Humberston Avenue have already made similar use of their land. It feels like a natural and fair progression to be able to do the same - especially when the space is available and not currently being used.

This development makes sense to me. The government has made it clear that more housing is needed, and I believe that smaller, better-designed homes like these help meet that need in a way that fits the character of the area. The homes in this plan are modest dormer bungalows - not large or intrusive - and they're ideal for couples, retirees, or those looking for quiet, manageable homes.

Even after the development, the remaining garden at No. 35 is still substantial, and the space is more than enough for private use. I believe we have a responsibility to use land sensibly, and this seems like a good way to create new homes while still respecting the feel of the neighbourhood.

Item 3 - 13 Orkney Place
Immingham - DM/0199/26/FUL

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andy Hopkins

Address: Civic Centre, Pelham Road Immingham DN40 1QF

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Parish Council

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: At the Council meeting on 22/4/26 the Town Council decided to object to this planning application.

The Council agrees with neighbours comments about issues with regards to how close it is to other properties, there is no noise assessment, environment issues such as smell and noise and the effect to those nearby, and the increased traffic down this cul-de-sac.

We feel that this would be detrimental to the properties in the proximity.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery (Noise Impact Assessment received May 2026 and Odour Management Plan received April 2026)

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Lucy Waller

Address: Civic Centre Pelham Road Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1QF

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Parish Council

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Immingham Town Council considered the Noise Impact Assessment and Odour Management Plan at its meeting on 17 June 2026 and resolved to uphold its previous objection to the application.

The Council remains concerned about the proximity of the proposed development to neighbouring residential properties and the potential impact of noise, odour, increased traffic and general disturbance on local residents. The submitted documents do not alter the Council's view that the proposal would be detrimental to residential amenity.

The Council therefore maintains its objection and continues to support the concerns raised by local residents.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mr Mike Emptage

Address: 47 Defender Drive Grimsby DN37 9PS

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The applicant has successfully and responsibly operated a similar sized licensed 5-star rated cattery at her existing property for a number of years and I am sure will do so at this location ensuring minimal disturbance to all and any neighbouring residents.

RECEIVED

- 3 JUN 2026

2, ORKNEY PLACE

1 M M I N G H A M

DN 40 1RL

PLANNING APP. REF DM/0199/26/FVL

DEAR SIR.

With ref to the above planning app. No matter how many amendment a put forward we do NOT want this cattery down our street. It will be right next to a dog sitting service. This is a very quiet cul-de-sac of fifteen private houses not a commercial street. and how a noise impact and odour can be made when there are no cats here is unbelievable. Once again we do not want it down our street

P & C M THOMAS

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mr PHILIP POOL

Address: 12 ORKNEY PLACE IMMINGHAM DN401RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Further to my submission to the Planning Portal dated 14/04/2026

I read with interest the noise impact assessment report submitted by ENS on the 14/05/2026 to the North East Lincs Planning Portal. It states that the most affected properties will more than likely be the two properties either side of number 13 Orkney Place, Immingham, that being numbers 14 and 12.

Number 14 is highly unlikely to object to this proposal as there is already a Dog Care business being run from that address and would probably not wish to draw any more attention to it than it has already attracted.

That therefore leaves us, the residents of number 12 Orkney Place suffering the worst effects if planning permission is granted to object to the proposed Cattery.

The noise impact assessment report is complicated for ordinary people to understand and argue against as formulae and figures are used to verify their findings. However, what I do find odd is the location of another cattery located in Leeds as part of their justification process. If you look on Google Earth the location of this cattery, known as Station House Cattery, Horsforth, Leeds, LS13 1NP bears no resemblance to the quiet location of Orkney Place, Immingham. In fact, it is the Polar opposite.

To the rear of the property is a two track Railway Line, with a main road in close proximity to it. On the other side of the Railway Line is what looks to be a reasonably industrialised area of quite some size. How can this property be compared to our quiet cull de sac with only 15 private houses and only one way in or out?

The Report does mention measurements of existing surrounding noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed Cattery at 13 Orkney Place and that any noise levels created by the cats will not go above this. Quoted is the noise created by the concrete road surface of the A180. This depends on the wind direction and even then it is intermittent. Even this level of noise may soon be significantly reduced when the road surface is eventually replaced. Are we really led to believe that cats housed in a domestic garage directly next to my boundary/house/patio area/rear entrance to house will have no noise nuisance value to our lives. I don't think so!!!

The building in question is a domestic garage of single brick construction and pantile roof. A building of this construction and in such close proximity to our property used for the purpose of a cattery will not afford us the noise privacy that you would expect in a quiet residential area. It is located right on the boundary of my property and is 12 feet from the side of my House and only eighteen feet from my back door which we use as the main entry/exit point to the property. Furthermore, it runs along the driveway boundary of my property which is fully gated off on my side behind which is a paved patio area which is a sun trap and not overlooked by adjoining properties. This is used daily in the warm summer months. Please see the photographs supplied to the designated Planning officer (Becca Soulsby) for this case. She has visited No. 13 and my own property No. 12 and commented that she had not realised how close it was to our boundary and house.

3 Orkney Place,
Immingham,
N E Lincs,
DN40 1RL

10th June 2026

OBJECTION.

Planning Ref: DM/0199/26/FUL

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am objecting to the above planning application for the following reasons:

Orkney Place is a small cul de sac where a lot of retired people live. They live here because it is so quiet and peaceful.

If the cattery is approved there will be 3 animal related businesses in one area, and it will no longer be a quiet residential area, but more like a commercial/ business area.

Cats will be dropped off from 8am onwards, so cars will be in and out of the street for the rest of the day, with people coming and going, and all the noise associated with this.

The cattery could also pose a health hazard, and will certainly smell, due to the amount of waste produced by up to 14 cats kept in a small single garage.

The plans show no provision for getting rid of the waste after the garage has been cleaned out, so the run off would presumably be hosed along the drive and out into the street drains.

They are already very slow to drain, so there will be foul smelling sludge left in the road gutters and the drains could eventually block.

George and Marlies Green.

RECEIVED

16 JUN 2026

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Marlies Green

Address: 3 Orkney Place Immingham DN40 1RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I have read the other objections which have been submitted against this proposal and fully agree with them. I think that yet another pet boarding business in this quiet residential cul-de-sac would be seriously detrimental to our amenities with the extra traffic and disturbance this will inevitably generate. In conclusion, I strongly object to the proposal.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mrs C Croft

Address: 4 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The applicant already runs Grassmere Cattery at Stallingborough.

It's well away from the village, in large grounds in the countryside.

This is an ideal place for it.

A single garage in Orkney Place, a small cul -de -sac in Immingham isn't a good place.

There are already 2 animal related businesses in the area.

14 Orkney Place runs a dog day care and boarding kennels.

Drop off starts at 8am, the same time as the cattery.

From then on there will be cars coming and going all day.

5 Shetland way is "Chien Chic" a dog grooming business.

This is on the corner of Orkney Place, and the frontage is on Orkney Place itself.

Out of 4 houses in a row 3 will be animal related businesses.

There are only 15 houses in Orkney Place.

The plans are not clear about ventilation, but the smell coming from up to 14 cats and their waste, in a single garage will be awful, especially in summer.

This new cattery facility certainly won't be "an asset to the local area" as stated in the covering letter.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery (Noise Impact Assessment received May 2026 and Odour Management Plan received April 2026)

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mr Trevor Thompson

Address: 7 Orkney Place Orkney place Immingham DN40 1RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: A quiet cul-de-sac with just 15 houses, already crumbling roads and pavements doesn't need or want a cattery. The chaos with cars dropping off dogs at one address and cats next door is absolutely ridiculous. The smell from 14 cats will be overpowering, we as residents don't want to smell either the cats or the chemicals that will be used to cover up the smell. We don't want our driveways blocked by traffic at different times of the day and evening. This is essentially a quiet area and needs to stay that way two animal businesses is more than enough for such a small residential area.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Susan Thompson

Address: 7 Orkney place Immingham DN401RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Making a cattery next door to a kennel in a quiet residential area of just 15 houses is not a good idea. The cul-de-sac road is already crumbling and full of pot holes without any extra traffic. The pavements are a disgrace crumbling and full of holes. Drop off /pick up times will be disturbing for the residents not to mention the barking from the numerous dogs in the kennel next door.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery (Noise Impact Assessment received May 2026 and Odour Management Plan received April 2026)

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Gill Altoft

Address: 8 Orkney Place Immingham DN40 1RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to agree and support the recent comments from 13 Orkney Place and would like to add as residents of Orkney Place over the last few years we have lost some of our privacy with a large estate built behind the cul de sac which impacts on our views. This and already 2 animal businesses in a small quiet residential area may impact on our house values with a 3rd. It certainly won't help!

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery (Noise Impact Assessment received May 2026 and Odour Management Plan received April 2026)

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Gillian Altoft

Address: 8 Orkney place Immingham Dn40 1RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Further to my previous comments I would like to correct my error and say I am in agreement with the comments made by 12 & 15 Orkney Place. The points made are very valid! I would also urge the planning committee to object to such a business in a quiet residential cul de sac!

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Gillian Altoft

Address: 8 Orkney Place Immingham DN40 1RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: My main concern is in a small cul de sac of 15 houses which could possibly have 2 businesses next door to each other concerning pick ups and drop offs. The application is 7 days a week with no time constraints? The road and footpaths are already in a terrible state and with extra traffic will only get worse.

A quiet residential cul de sac is not a suitable place for one business let alone another next door!

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery (Noise Impact Assessment received May 2026 and Odour Management Plan received April 2026)

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mr PHILIP POOL

Address: 12 ORKNEY PLACE IMMINGHAM DN401RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I refer to the comments made by Mr Steve Davidson of No. 15 Orkney Place and thank him for drawing to my attention that the CLEANING WASTE DISPOSAL AND ODOUR MANAGEMENT PLAN has to be opened up as a separate document in order to fully view its content.

Having now read it in full it only reinforces my previous objections to this Planning application due to the close proximity of my property as previously stated.

Am I and other residents really led to believe that the copious amounts of cleaning agents and disinfectant odours that will be needed to keep these 7 pens (14 cats) clean and hygienic will not permeate out of this converted garage.

Due to its single skin brick wall and pantile roof construction odour leakage of all kinds will be virtually impossible to stop and therefore impact our lives for the reasons stated above and in previous letters of objection.

This is not a suitable business to be operated so close to other people's residential properties and outside garden areas. It would affect our daily lives particularly in the warm summer months when we use our outside spaces the most and the customers who will use this business will be going away on holiday and leaving their cats at this property.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mr PHILIP POOL

Address: 12 ORKNEY PLACE IMMINGHAM DN401RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I have read the comments from other residents in Orkney Place with regard to this Planning Application. I still find it astonishing that a business of this nature can be set up and run in a small residential cul de sac even though there is already a dog boarding/walking business already operating from number 14 Orkney Place next door to the proposed application. Traffic and noise from that business has already had an impact on what is essentially a road that is primarily used by the residents of the street.

As the owner of number 12 Orkney Place, effectively the house on the other side of number 13 I do have concerns about the effect on our daily life. The garage that is being converted runs along the driveway boundary of my property which is fully gated off on my side behind which is a paved patio area which is a sun trap and not overlooked by adjoining properties. This is used on a daily basis in the warm summer months.

I would like to know why some other area of the reasonably large garden could not have been utilised for this facility which would not have had the impact it could potentially have on our daily life. Our main concern is the noise that will be generated on a quiet area of our garden from the potential of 14 Cats residing in this structure along with other concerns already raised by other residents.

With regards to the noise concern I cannot see how this can be assessed unless the facility is fully installed and occupied by 14 cats and assessed over a period of time. By this time it would have to be operational and then too late to stop the running of the business.

These noise concerns would be less impactful on our garden if this facility was located elsewhere in their garden and further from my boundary.

No one is questioning the way this business would be run or the care given to the cats in question, but is this really the best place for a business which was previously out in the countryside and away from other properties. Quiet residential streets are for families to live in and not run businesses which could potentially disrupt our neighbourhood.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery (Noise Impact Assessment received May 2026 and Odour Management Plan received April 2026)

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Mr Steve Davidson

Address: 15 Orkney Place Immingham DN40 1RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I submit that there will be a perceived change in the quality of life, particularly to the immediately adjoining residents from the noise emitted by up to 14 cats and noise and disturbance created by customers dropping off and picking up cats, most likely in motor vehicles. The technical noise assessment is complex and theoretical but does not take account of the fact that the human ear is far more sensitive to noise than a test microphone. It does not take account of the psychological impact on resident exposed to cat noise 24/7. As with all such studies, the technical is used to hide the actual impact of noise on real people.

With regard to the cleaning regime and odour control document, this is suggestive of a necessary commercial cleaning and sanitising operation which is entirely out of scale in a quiet residential cul-de-sac which suggests that the proposal should be refused planning permission. The statement says that the proposed commercial cleansing regime "should" prevent obnoxious odours but what happens if it doesn't? Also, how could the proposal to only board neutered cats be enforced? I am also concerned by the mention of illness and disease control measures which further suggests to me that this use is clearly not acceptable in a residential area.

We already have 2 pet related businesses operating in this area and a third business will further adversely affect the residential amenities of the cul-de-sac and should definitely not be permitted. I would therefore urge the Council's Planning Committee to refuse planning permission for the proposed use.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0199/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0199/26/FUL

Address: 13 Orkney Place Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RL

Proposal: Change of use and alterations of domestic garage to form cattery

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Customer Details

Name: Steve Davidson

Address: 15 Orkney Place Immingham DN40 1RL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Orkney Place is a quiet residential cul-de-sac. There is already a licensed dog home boarding business adjacent to the application site. Another similar business will result in possible doubling of customer's vehicles visiting the road with associated noise and disturbance to our residential amenities. Also, there is the possibility of trade vehicles delivering supplies etc. to the business

The application states that opening hours are not relevant but I would contend that they are most relevant in a quiet residential cul-de-sac. How will proposed opening hours be enforced? Will there be any restriction on week-end operations? All of this disturbance to residential amenities and additional commercialisation is unacceptable in this area.

The carriageway and footways in Orkney Place are already in a poor state of repair and this proposal will only exacerbate this.

The application states 'No' to trade effluent. This does not clarify where the waste cat faeces or urine from up to 14 cats will be stored. Will this be in airtight containers to prevent smells? Will additional wheelie bins or commercial waste disposal be involved?

The application says that prior planning advice was sought but no details are given for those affected to consider.

If this commercial proposal is considered suitable in a residential area can there be any guarantee that 'cat rescue' will not be undertaken with possible additional disturbance to residential amenities?

In conclusion I strongly object to this proposal on the grounds that the additional commercialisation of this quiet residential cul-de-sac would result in significant deterioration of the residential amenities of the area.

Item 4 - Land Adj To Bradley
Woodlands Independent Hospital
Bradley Road Bradley - DM/0369/25/
FUL

Comments for Planning Application DM/0369/25/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0369/25/FUL

Address: Land Adj To Bradley Woodlands Independent Hospital Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Demolish existing farm buildings to erect one dwelling. Installation of new vehicular access, associated landscaping and various associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Bradley Parish Council

Address: Bull Ring Church Lane, Bradley Grimsby DN37 0AE

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Parish Council

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Bradley Parish Council held an extra ordinary meeting on 24th June 2025 to discuss the above mentioned planning application.

The Council had received one email from a resident of Bradley objecting to the application and the same resident has formally objected to the application via the NELC website.

All issues mentioned in the email were raised with the applicant, who was present at the meeting, and they were answered and explained very satisfactorily.

Further details about the plans involving the work on the site and the access road were discussed, and Bradley Parish Council were satisfied with all the responses.

Therefore, Bradley Parish Council have no objections to the Planning Application and look forward to welcoming the applicant and his family to the village.

From: val
Sent: 23 March 2026 17:07
To: Planning - IGE
Subject: Planning Application DM/0369/25/FUL (Amendments)

Categories: Purple Category

Good Afternoon,

With reference to the above Planning Application (Amendments) and as a resident of Bradley village for over 20years, most of those as a member of Bradley Parish Council, I fully support this application along with the amendments.

The proposed building on the site , and particularly accessing the site via the access off Bradley Road will mean that no works vehicles etc will need to pass through the village so no problems there, and with the suggested design along with the proposed landscaping I think that site will be better than it's ever been , a real asset to the village.

Through the time that the current owner/applicant of The Woodlands Farm has been part of our Bradley community he has been a great asset to the village, especially when we have had a couple of emergencies , a tree down across Church Lane and problems with mud on the road creating a dangerous surface he was there with practical help instantly.

I can see no problems or negatives with this application whatsoever.

Regards
Val Turner.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0369/25/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0369/25/FUL

Address: Land Adj To Bradley Woodlands Independent Hospital Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Demolish existing farm buildings and erect one detached dwelling (NPPF - Paragraph 84), creation of vehicular access with new access gates, pillars and fencing, and associated landscaping and various works - AMENDED DESCRIPTION & FURTHER INFO REC 27-04-2026
Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Val Turner

Address: Meadowside, Church Lane Bradley Grimsby DN37 0AE

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed design of this property and surrounding area would, I feel, be a wonderful addition to the village and also the calmness of the area for encouraging wildlife after all the industrial business this land has been used for in the past when it was a poultry farm with sheds falling down and the site being in a general state of bad repair.

Through the time that this application has been ongoing it has become apparent that the applicant would be a real asset to our village community. He has already been very helpful with several situations in the village, a tree falling down, mud on the road etc. To have an addition access to the site off Bradley Road would certainly lessen the number of vehicles passing through the village especially during the development stage so a real advantage.

From: Val Turner

Sent: 05 June 2025 14:51

To: Planning - IGE (Equans) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning Application DM/0369/25/FUL - Woodlands Poultry Farm

Good Afternoon,

With reference to the above application and as the previous Chair for Bradley Parish Council but now retired, I think it is important for me to submit my views on this.

From the point that this applicant purchased Woodlands Farm he has consistently been a very community minded, conscientious member of Bradley Parish. On several occasions when we have had relatively serious situations in the village, trees blowing down to block the road, bad weather leaving Church Lane very muddy and dangerous Mr Cain has instantly come to our rescue and helped without hesitation, and I'm sure if this application is approved he will be a helpful member of our community.

With regard to the application itself I can not see any reason for objection, particularly as it includes a new access away from Church Lane and if all the ground work that Mr Cain has done up to the present time to improve the overall site is anything to go by then I feel it has to be a bonus all round to see this application completed, I am definitely in favour of it.

One minor point that I have picked up from one of the environmental reports, it is stating that this application is to include some cabins/lodges of some kind but I can't see any reference to that on the official application however because of the independent access applied for should these cabins/lodges be included I wouldn't have any objections to that either.

Regards

Val Turner

Meadowside

Church Lane

Bradley

Grimsby

DN37 0AE.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0369/25/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0369/25/FUL

Address: Land Adj To Bradley Woodlands Independent Hospital Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Demolish existing farm buildings to erect one dwelling. Installation of new vehicular access, associated landscaping and various associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Mike McTurk

Address: Woodlands Church Lane Bradley DN37 0AE

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Woodlands, The Bridleway, Off Church Lane, Bradley, DN37 0AE, NE Lincolnshire

Mr M J McTurk

RE: Planning DM/0369/25/FUL

Demolish Existing Farm Buildings to Erect One Dwelling. Installation of New Access and Associated Landscaping and Various Associated Works

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to formally express my support for the approval of this application.

The applicant and landowner, Mr. K. Cain, has maintained an open and transparent line of communication with the Bradley Parish Council and the residents of Bradley Village. All parties have been fully informed on the design development and his vision for the land. The building is intended to be reflective of, and respectful to, its surrounding environment while providing a high-quality designed property inclusive of innovative features to meet sustainability requirements.

During a public consultation meeting with BPC Mr Cain presented the final design for his property and landscape details. The presentation consisted of several computer-generated images of the proposed property nestled into its surrounding area. This was complimented with a scaled model of the property. This allowed all attendees to thoroughly understand and appreciate Mr Cain's

vision for developing the site. The proposal received unanimous support from both BPC and the local residents of Bradley Village who were present at the meeting.

I look forward to seeing the development of this innovative design being fully constructed over the next few years.

Yours faithfully

Mr M J McTurk

Comments for Planning Application DM/0369/25/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0369/25/FUL

Address: Land Adj To Bradley Woodlands Independent Hospital Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Demolish existing farm buildings and erect one detached dwelling (NPPF - Paragraph 84), relocation of existing vehicular access with new access gates, pillars and fencing, and associated landscaping and various works - AMENDED DESCRIPTION & FURTHER INFO REC 05-03-2026

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Debra McTurk

Address: Woodlands Church Lane Bradley DN37 0AE

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Sirs

From the very first site visit with the land owner it became very clear to me the proposal would be informed by the 'landscape' generating a site-specific architecture.

I very much support the proposal for the roofscape as landscape continuation at first floor level, incorporating substantial integrated planting beds forming planted terraces as structural landscape elements. I appreciate this approach will visually break the perceived mass of the upper floor, reduce hard horizontal roofline expression, extend the ground plane vertically and reinforce the building as a landscape structure rather than a conventional two-storey pavilion.

It is noticeable these planted terraces will soften the pavilion's profile and contribute to the building being read as layered garden platforms rather than a solid vertical façade.

The proposed architecture is not just environmentally competent it is landscape as architecture.

I support this application.

Mrs Debra McTurk

From: fiona cullen
Sent: 21 June 2025 10:33
To: Lauren Birkwood (Equans) <Lauren.Birkwood@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION - DM/0369/25/FUL

Good Morning Lauren,

In relation to the planning application.

I would like to add to my previous email in relation to new vehicle access for the new dwelling.

I have advised previously I worked for Humberside Police and we had terrible problems with boy racers entering Bradley Woods area.

I would like to voice my concern in this new vehicle access or widening of the road which is previously there. The road which is previously there has been securely gated off so only the farmers can enter.

If you do a new road or extend you are going to be looking at boy racers speeding then going straight onto Bradley Road. This will end up in a catastrophic accident or even multiple accidents.

Even residents or staff leaving or entering Bradley Woodlands.

I want this to be included in the meeting and please pass to the highways department which we discussed on our previous conversation.

Unfortunately I can not be present as I will be on holiday.

I have a friend present at the meeting so she will update me on the outcome of the meeting.

Kind Regards,

Fiona Cullen

1 Bradley Cottage
Bradley Road
Bradley Grimsby
DN37 0AH

From: fiona cullen
Sent: 12 June 2025 14:44
To: Lauren Birkwood (Equans) <Lauren.Birkwood@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION - DM/0369/25/FUL - CONCERNS NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS

Good Afternoon Lauren,

Further to our discussion this afternoon.

You advised me that I have to email your department first before the Highway department. My concerns are extremely worrying in relation to the widening of the vehicular access from Bradley Road leading to the new planning application.

I have lived at 1 Bradley Cottage for 27 years and Bradley Road has encountered various fatal road traffic accidents resulting in near misses and fatalities.

Unfortunately the motorists use Bradley Road as a race track especially the motorcycles.

Bradley Road is an extremely dangerous road but that part of the road where insulation to widen the road is even worse.

Vehicles for some unknown reason speed extremely fast from Bradley Woods right passed Bradley Village and this is the area which is deemed FATAL.

You have to consider the influx of pedestrians working or visiting Bradley Woodlands as that would be that dangerous location.

The planning application for this dwelling is a very large property of HIGHWAYS could be made aware.

The amount of materials for such a large dwelling would be enormous and extremely dangerous. They would not be able to access safely and would end up with a multiple pile up.

All the large heavy plant materials would be impossible to make it safe to gain access from Bradley Road.

I worked for the police for 25 years and certain police colleagues would always avoid Bradley Road due to the speeding and reckless driving.

If there were no concerns they would not have the speed camera van and roads traffic policing placed on Bradley Road and Church Lane.

This is a constant problem.

I want you to consider all my comments and if you do ignore my feedback I will have this as evidence stating in relation to a Fatal accident or multiple accidents and near misses.

Please may you forward my comments and concerns to relevant highways department please Lauren.

THANK YOU.

Kind Regards,

Fiona Cullen

Item 5 - Bull Rush Lakes Tetney Road
Humberston - DM/0960/25/FUL

North East Lincolnshire Planning
New Oxford House
George Street
Grimsby
North East Lincolnshire
DN31 1HB

Tel: 01472 326289 Option 1

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ward Member Reply Slip for Applications to be reported to the Planning Committee

Application Number	Reason for Referring to Planning Committee
RD5790 - Bull Rush Lakes, Tetney Road, Humberston	<p>This application is in process and it is believed that the previous reservations by environment agency have largely been addressed; so as this came to planning in its earlier form it is appropriate that the Planning Committee should receive this updated application and make its decision accordingly.</p> <p>To remind committee all ward councillors attended the site and are satisfied that the levels of the proposed development are significantly above both the adjoining ditch/dyke and the fishing lakes on site.</p> <p>This statement may be read at committee.</p>

/030

Contact Details: -

16 May 2026

Signature Date

Name Cllr Stan Shreeve



Humberston Village Council

Clerk to the Council – Mrs. K. Peers

[Tel:- 07494 577661](tel:07494577661)

Email:- clerk@humberstonvillagecouncil.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

3rd December 2025

The following planning applications were discussed at the meeting of Humberston Village Council held on Tuesday 2nd December 2025 and the comments below each application listed are the comments resolved to be submitted as follows:

Planning Application Reference: DM/0960/25/FUL

Proposal: Erection of a fishing holiday lodge on an established commercial fishing pond site with drainage and associated works

Location: Bull Rush Lakes Tetney Road Humberston

No objections.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. K. Peers – Clerk to the Council
Humberston Village Council

From: clerk@tetneyparishcouncil.gov.uk <clerk@tetneyparishcouncil.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 December 2025 10:10
To: Planning - IGE (Equans) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Planning Consultation Ref: DM/0960/25/FUL

You don't often get email from clerk@tetneyparishcouncil.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning,

Please note the email address is clerk@tetneyparishcouncil.gov.uk and not the gmail address you originally sent the consultation to.

Tetney Parish Council would like to submit the following comments relating to application DM/0960/25/FUL

"Planning condition needed stating for short-term use over the summer period only owing to potential flood risk. Is this a lodge or a structure that can be converted in the future to become a dwelling? This is another indirect way to get a dwelling on land outside village boundaries therefore conditions must be put in place to restrict future residential use and potential conversion."

Kind regards

Sue Booth

Tetney Parish Clerk

This email and any attachments are confidential and may be privileged. It is for the use of the named recipient(s) only. If you have received it in error, do not copy or disclose its contents and please notify us immediately and then delete it. Email transmission is not a secure means of communication nor is it guaranteed to be error free; emails can be intercepted, lost, destroyed, corrupted or contain viruses. Therefore, Tetney Parish Council does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message which arises as a result of email transmission, nor does it accept liability for any loss or damage caused by viruses. The contents of this message may contain personal views which are not the views of Tetney Parish Council, unless specifically stated.

From: planning@nelincs.gov.uk <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 November 2025 5:16 PM
To: tetneypc@gmail.com <tetneypc@gmail.com>
Subject: Planning Consultation Ref: DM/0960/25/FUL

Dear Sir/Madam
Please see attached letter.

Reduce your environmental footprint, please do not print this email unless you really need to.

North East Lincolnshire Council - This e-mail and any files transmitted with it contains information from North East Lincolnshire Council which may be privileged or confidential. The information is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient be aware that any processing of this email and its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please send it back to us immediately and permanently delete it. Do not use, copy or disclose the information contained in this message or in any attachment. The North East Lincolnshire Council email system, including emails and their content, may be monitored for security reasons and to ensure compliance with council policy. Emails and attachments may be recorded for the effective operation of the organisation and for other lawful business purposes. We cannot guarantee that this email or its attachments are virus free or has not been intercepted and amended. We therefore recommend you carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any email or attachments. North East Lincolnshire Council will not accept any liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this email or its attachments, or any damage or loss caused by computer viruses coming from this email or its attachments.

Item 6 - Willow Lakes Ashby Hill Top Farm Barton
Street Ashby Cum Fenby - DM/0226/26/FUL

From: clerk- Ashby cum Fenby pc
Sent: 01 June 2026 21:12
To: Planning - IGE <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Ashby cum Fenby Planning Comment

Good afternoon,

Please may I submit the following comment from Ashby cum Fenby Parish Council.

[Planning Application Reference: DM/0226/26/FUL](#)

Proposal: Variation of Condition 7 (Plans) following DC/104/13/WAB to alter site layout to amend lodge positions

Location: Willow Lakes Ashby Hill Top Farm Barton Street Ashby Cum Fenby North East Lincolnshire

Ashby cum Fenby recommends refusal of this application on grounds that the development could further exacerbate existing Ashby Cum Fenby drainage issues. Due to this risk, a drainage management plan should be in place and available to the Parish Council to view on the Portal.

Kind regards

Tanya Kuzemczak
Clerk to Ashby cum Fenby Parish Council

<https://ashbycumfenbypc.com>

The information in this message including any attachments may be confidential or privileged and is for the use of the named recipient only. If you are not the named or intended recipient you may not copy, distribute, or deliver this message to anyone or take any action in reliance on it. If you receive this message in error please contact Ashby cum Fenby Parish Council immediately by email and delete it from your system.

Scanned by Anti Virus Software.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0226/26/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0226/26/FUL

Address: Willow Lakes Ashby Hill Top Farm Barton Street Ashby Cum Fenby North East
Lincolnshire DN37 0RU

Proposal: Variation of Condition 7 (Plans) following DC/104/13/WAB to alter site layout to amend
lodge positions

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Dagmar Hayes

Address: Deer Farm Telford House Barton Street, Ashby-cum-Fenby Grimsby DN37 0RU

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am happy for Willow Lakes Ashby Hill Top Farm to alter its site layout and amend the
position of its lodges as it does not have an impact on the Deer Farm at Telfod House.

Item 7 - 28 Heneage Road Grimsby -
DM/0397/25/FUL

North East Lincolnshire Council
 Planning Department
 Municipal Offices
 Town Hall Square
 Grimsby
 North East Lincolnshire
 DN31 1HU

Tel: 01472 326289 Option 1

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ward Member Reply Slip for Applications to be reported to the Planning Committee

Application Number	Reason for Referring to Planning Committee
DM/0397/25/FUL	<p>Residents have concerns about Anti-Social Behaviour and Noise emanating from this potential development.</p> <p>They are also concerned that this development will be for children from outside our arear.</p>

Contact Details: -

SignatureS. Beasant..... Date27/4/26.....

NameCllr S. Beasant.....

Address:51 Columbia Road, Grimsby.....

.....

Peter L Pounds
30 Heneage Road
Grimsby, DN32 9Es

27th April.

Dear Lauren Birkwood, I am replying to the planning application ref; DM/0397/25/FUL.

I have been told that No.28 is to be used as a children's home for 16 – 17 year olds with live -in assisted accommodation. We have lived at NO.30 for over 50 years and in that time we have had tenants who have been noisy and even had 2 drugs deaths. We are both retired teachers living in quiet area and don't want noisy teenagers living next door. Our neighbours are of the same opinion. No. 29 across the road is also planned for children and we all objected to this ,but we were ignored.No.27 also strongly objected as they do with this change of use at No.28. You say there are 3 spaces in the alley , but one is ours. The back alley is for the use of houses 24-30.

As our garden is secluded and not overlooked , we have become naturists, which should not be a problem .

Yours P.L .Pounds

RECEIVED

29 APR 2026

Comments for Planning Application DM/0397/25/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0397/25/FUL

Address: 28 Heneage Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 9ES

Proposal: Change of use from a single residential dwelling (C3) to residential supported living accommodation (C2)

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Pamela Joan Pounds

Address: Heneage Road 30 Grimsby DN35 8DD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We have lived here for over 50 years, we are both retired teachers. We have had problems with noisy neighbours and drug use at 28 Heneage Road, also with the house opposite no 29 when it was a children's home, police there every week.

16 and 17 year olds are the most difficult even if some one is living in.

The application says 3 parking spaces which there are not, we have access to our back via the 8 foot as do 24 to 30 Heneage Road.

We also object to the planning for no 29 but you have still gone ahead with it.

All neighbours objected