

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

APPEALS LIST - 24th July 2026

APPLICATION NUMBER & SITE ADDRESS

APPEAL REFERENCE & STATUS

OFFICER & PROCEDURE

DM/0740/24/CEU 167 Hainton Avenue Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 9LF	AP/006/25 INPROG	Bethany Loring Written Representation
DM/0854/25/CEA 4 Westhill Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN34 4SF	AP/004/26 INPROG	Abigail Hattersley Written Representation
DM/0919/25/FUL 17 Walker Avenue Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN33 2LL	AP/007/26 INPROG	Abigail Hattersley Written Representation
DM/0749/25/OUT Land Off Mushroom Lane Brigsley North East Lincolnshire DN37 0BJ	AP/008/26 INPROG	Lauren Birkwood Written Representation
DM/0806/24/FUL Land Adjacent To 9 Ashby Close And 19 Glenfield Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire	AP/009/26 INPROG	Lauren Birkwood Written Representation

DM/0189/26/TPO 32 Meadowbank Great Coates North East Lincolnshire DN37 9PG	AP/011/26 INPROG	Paul Chaplin Fast Track
DM/0713/25/FUL 39A And 39B Lord Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN31 2ND	AP/012/26 INPROG	Lauren Birkwood Written Representation
Stallingborough Road Immingham North East Lincolnshire	AP/013/26 ENFORCEMENT APPEAL INPROG	Martin Ambler Written Representation
DM/0468/25/OUT Land Parcel At Waltham Road Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshire	AP/014/26 INPROG	Richard Limmer Written Representation



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2026

by Richard Snow BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6008086

119 First Main Road, Humberston Fitties, Humberston, North East Lincolnshire DN36 4EZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Margaret Wainwright against the decision of North East Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref is DM/0536/23/FULA.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a replacement shed with decking, rear timber fence and decking to rear of chalet.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a replacement shed with decking, rear timber fence and decking to rear of chalet at 119 First Main Road, Humberston Fitties, Humberston, North East Lincolnshire DN36 4EZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM/0536/23/FULA, and the submitted plans consisting of the site location plan dated 4 May 2023, the block plan of the same date and drawing no GW/DW/FMR/1 (proposed floor plans and elevations).

Preliminary Matters

2. In the description of development above I have removed words not relating to acts of development.
3. I observed during my site visit that the proposal has already taken place. There is uncertainty between the main parties in respect of the height of the proposed rear boundary fence. The plans show a proposed timber fence of 1.8m in height, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Humberston Fitties Conservation Area (HFCA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within the HFCA which was designated in 1996 and covers an area of 2.66 hectares of irregular "plotlands", housing an eclectic mix of predominantly wooden chalets originally developed to house servicemen and more recently serve as holiday homes. The appellant has provided a copy of the Humberston Fitties Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (2003). The council considers this document to be out of date and does not rely on it in evidence. In so far as it contains a commentary on the history and character of

the HFCA, the document appears relevant to the appeal, and I have had regard to it in my decision. The council's Humberston Fitties Conservation Area Chalet Design Guide (1997, revised 2000) (the Design Guide) includes guiding principles to influence the appearance and layout of development within the HFCA. The council has confirmed that the Design Guide is not a Supplementary Planning Document and I have no evidence that it has been the subject of public consultation. This limits the weight I attribute to it.

6. The character of the HFCA is formed by lines of chalets of diverse appearance flanking lengthy access roads. The variation in appearance of the chalets contributes to the area's charm and character, and whilst positioned behind a generally uniform building line, their haphazard alignment to the road serves to advance the individuality of the chalets. Most are clad in timber, and a significant number have detached ancillary buildings including sheds, commonly positioned adjacent to plot boundaries. Frontages are generally enclosed by low picket style fencing creating a feeling of openness to the street scene with rear boundaries frequently enclosed by taller, solid fencing. The significance of the HFCA is derived from its historic association with housing military personnel and the architecture of the buildings.
7. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that in the exercise of planning functions, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area (CA). I accordingly give great weight to this duty in assessing the proposal.
8. The appeal property has an appearance typical of the HFCA. It is a single storey, timber clad chalet, and presents to the street at an angle. Its plot is broadly rectangular and is flanked to the north by a beach access path leading to the coastal footpath atop sand dunes beyond the rear boundary of the site. The front and side boundaries are enclosed by low timber fencing. In displaying these features typical of the HFCA, the appeal site positively contributes to its character.
9. The proposed shed replaced two that existed in the same position, and is located at the rear of the plot, in accordance with the principles of the Design Guide. I observed that, in a similar manner to that proposed, a significant majority of plots close to the appeal site include sheds and outbuildings positioned adjacent or close to plot boundaries, including the replacement shed at no 121 referenced in evidence. Many of these other examples are in more prominent and visible locations. Whilst diverting from the principles in the Design Guide, this widespread and established pattern of outbuildings now contributes to the character of the HFCA and the proposed shed reflects this character.
10. The size of new sheds is not a matter addressed in the Design Guide and I noted that the size of the proposal does not differ significantly from the size of outbuildings on several nearby plots. Furthermore, whilst visible from sections of the beach access path to the north, and in a narrow viewpoint from the front, views of the shed from the coastal footpath to the rear are prevented by ground level differences and substantial trees and vegetation. The proposed shed is not therefore, a prominent feature in the CA.
11. By not being attached to the chalet itself, the council identifies that the decking attached to the shed contradicts the principles of the Design Guide.

Notwithstanding this, due to its low height and limited ground coverage, the decking does not affect the open character of the plot and is only appreciable along short sections of the beach access path to the north.

12. The proposed fencing along the rear boundary of the plot is reflective of the height and style of fencing on numerous nearby plots and reflects the established character of the HFCA as a consequence. Whilst the Design Guide seeks to restrict boundary fencing to a height not exceeding 1m, it is clear in specifying that such restrictions apply only to boundaries forward of the front face of the chalet which is not the case here.
13. The decking attached to the rear of the chalet accords with the principles of the Design Guide and retains the open character of the plot. The council raises no concern with this element of the proposal.
14. Having regard to all of the above, I find that the development in its entirety makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the HFCA and preserves the character and appearance of the HFCA as a whole and its significance. The proposal therefore accords with Policies 5, 12, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2013 – 2023) (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework which collectively seek to ensure new development is of an appropriate size and scale and protects and enhances places of historic character and appearance including designated heritage assets.
15. No planning conditions were suggested by the council or the appellant and none are necessary.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the proposal accords with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Snow

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2026

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6006544

Woodland View, Old Main Road, Barnoldby le Beck, Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire DN37 0BE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Dr Khurram Barlas against the decision of North East Lincolnshire Council.
- The application Ref is DM/0721/25/FULA.
- The development proposed is erect two storey side and rear extensions with Juliet balconies proposed within rear and side elevations to include alterations to the existing roof and repositioning of rooflights, erect single storey rear extension with a roof lantern, with associated drainage and various associated works (Amended Plans Received 02.09.2025 detailing sun tubes to the west side roof elevation).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to erect two storey side and rear extensions with Juliet balconies proposed within rear and side elevations to include alterations to the existing roof and repositioning of rooflights, erect single storey rear extension with a roof lantern, with associated drainage and various associated works (Amended Plans Received 02.09.2025 detailing sun tubes to the west side roof elevation) at Woodland View, Old Main Road, Barnoldby le Beck, Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire DN37 0BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM/0721/25/FULA, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Dr Khurram Barlas against North East Lincolnshire Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. In general, appeals are determined on the same basis as the original application. Accompanying the appellant's grounds of appeal is a daylight and sunlight study which was not before the Council when it made its decision. It is a new technical assessment of the daylight and sunlight implications of the development. The appeal is being determined on the basis of a part 1 written representations procedure, therefore, I find that accepting the daylight and sunlight study as new evidence would be procedurally unfair – the Council and interested parties have had no opportunity to comment on it. Consequently, in making my decision, I have disregarded the daylight and sunlight study.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of The Oakes, with particular reference to outlook, privacy and light.

Reasons

5. Woodland View is a large, detached house set within a spacious plot, served by large gardens. The closest neighbouring property is The Oakes to the west, whilst it benefits from there being no neighbouring properties located on the land to its immediate south, north and east. The Oakes is also a large, detached house. On its northern side, it is served by a large rear garden containing both extensive areas of lawn and patio.
6. As part of the development, a two-storey extension is proposed closer to Woodland View's western boundary to provide a new living room and prayer room at ground floor, and a new bedroom with en-suite and dressing room at first floor. Projecting 9.45 metres (m) from the rear of the existing house, this would constitute a considerable rearward extension.
7. However, rather than being positioned directly on the shared property boundary with The Oakes, it would be set in from it. The extension's roof ridge height would be much lower than that of the main roof, and it would incorporate a hipped roof form, with its roof pitch sloping away from the boundary. These design facets would assist in reducing the extension's sense of scale and mass.
8. Although this new living room, prayer room and bedroom extension would flank windows serving a home office and kitchen within The Oakes, that serving the kitchen is well-separated from where the extension would be positioned and, furthermore, the home office is also served by a set of French doors and the kitchen by a more principal window which each face south over The Oakes' spacious rear garden. In addition, the window to home office which would oppose the proposed extension already faces Woodland View's existing two-storey side elevation as well as a hedge and fence which, altogether, provides a strong sense of enclosure on this side. As a result, the main outlook from the home office and kitchen at The Oakes would be retained.
9. Although The Oakes has external seating and patio areas adjacent to the shared boundary with Woodland View, its rear garden is of such substantial size that extensive areas would remain well removed from the extension. As a result, the rear garden would not be visually dominated by the extension, and it would retain a generally open aspect in several directions. Furthermore, as the rear garden lies to the north of The Oakes, those areas closest to the rear of the house and the shared boundary are likely to already experience a considerable degree of shading. For these reasons, the extension would not unduly limit light within The Oakes' rear garden.
10. As the extension would project rearwards by over 9m, views from the nearest north-facing bedroom within Woodland View across The Oakes' rear garden would become more oblique than at present. Windows are also proposed at first-floor level within Woodland View's west facing elevation, but a condition can be imposed which would ensure that these would be obscurely glazed. The sun tubes would be small openings in the roof slope, and they would be angled towards the sky. The boundary fence and hedging would together effectively screen views from the proposed ground floor windows. For these reasons, the privacy of the occupants of The Oakes would not be unduly infringed upon.
11. Consequently, although the development would include a new living room, prayer room and bedroom extension amounting to a considerable rearward extension,

and new fenestration, there are facets of the proposed design and of the layout, orientation and arrangement of Woodland View and The Oakes which means that the ensuing effects would be mitigated. No unacceptable loss of outlook, privacy or light would occur for the occupiers of The Oakes.

12. The remaining extensions and alterations proposed as part of the development would provide Woodland View with a new dining hall, extended utility, inner hall, day room, home gym with shower, master bedroom with en-suite and dressing room, and an extended bedroom. These elements would enlarge and alter the property primarily on its eastern side, or would be set well away from, or screened from, The Oakes. Consequently, these aspects of the development would also not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of The Oakes.
13. Therefore, I conclude that the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of The Oakes, with particular reference to outlook, privacy and light, would be acceptable. As a result, the development complies with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 to 2032 which, in summary and amongst other matters, sets out that developments will be considered with regard to their suitability and sustainability, including in respect to their size and scale and their impacts on neighbouring land uses.

Other Matters

14. It is suggested to me that an alternative development proposal could have been devised, one incorporating a design which would result in lesser effects on the occupiers of The Oakes. However, I must determine the development which is the subject of the appeal on its own merits and, in my main issue, I have set out the reasons why its effect on the occupiers of The Oakes would be acceptable.
15. The plans propose that the development would be served by water butts. A condition can be imposed to ensure this. With this approach to drainage secured, I have no firm basis on which to conclude that the development would not be adequately drained or would result in any increase in flood risks.
16. Large, detached houses set within generous plots are characteristic of the appearance of the area and its overall character. Although the proposed development would substantially enlarge Woodland View and may extend beyond its original plot, it would remain consistent with this prevailing character as a substantial dwelling within a spacious setting. The design and use of external materials would also complement both the host property and the surrounding area. As such, the development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the locality.
17. Interested party representations assert that tree planting around Woodland View has not been undertaken in accordance with a previously imposed planning condition. However, this is a separate planning compliance matter, and it has no meaningful bearing on my decision on the appeal proposal.

Conditions

18. The Council has provided a list of suggested conditions that it considers would be appropriate. I have considered these in the light of the tests for the imposition of conditions set out within the National Planning Policy Framework and the content

of the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of clarity or precision, I have made some amendments to the Council's suggestions.

19. My schedule of conditions includes condition 1, which sets out the standard time limitation, and condition 2, which is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and necessary supporting documentation for the reason of certainty.
20. Condition 3, relating to the use of external materials, is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. I have imposed condition 4 to ensure that the site is adequately drained. Conditions 5 and 6 are each needed to ensure that the effects of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers are acceptable: the former in relation to the construction phase of the development, and the latter in relation to the privacy of the occupiers of The Oakes.

Conclusion

21. The development accords with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

H Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:
dmc 25694/002
dmc 25694/003 rev B
dmc 25694/004 rev A
dmc 25694/005 rev A
application form dated 11 August 2025
- 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials identified in section 10 of the application form dated 11 August 2025.
- 4) The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied or brought into use until the surface water drainage scheme, comprising of water butts, has been completed in accordance with the details shown on approved drawing dmc 25694/003 rev B. Thereafter, the approved surface water drainage scheme shall be retained.
- 5) Demolition or construction works shall take place only between 08:00 and 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturdays, and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
- 6) Each of the proposed first-floor, side elevation (west) windows, as identified on approved drawing dmc 25694/003 rev B, shall be obscured to at least level 3 of the Pilkington glass privacy scale (or equivalent). None of the rooms served by the proposed first-floor, side elevation (west) windows shall be occupied/brought into use until each of those windows have been obscured to at least level 3 of the Pilkington glass privacy scale (or equivalent). Once installed as such, the windows shall thereafter be retained.



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2026

by Henry Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: 6006544

**Woodland View, Old Main Road, Barnoldby le Beck, Grimsby, North East
Lincolnshire DN37 0BE**

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Dr Khurram Barlas for a full award of costs against North East Lincolnshire Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission to erect two storey side and rear extensions with Juliet balconies proposed within rear and side elevations to include alterations to the existing roof and repositioning of rooflights, erect single storey rear extension with a roof lantern, with associated drainage and various associated works (Amended Plans Received 02.09.2025 detailing sun tubes to the west side roof elevation).
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, the Planning Practice Guidance advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. The development includes a two-storey extension, projecting 9.45 metres from the rear of Woodland View. This would constitute a considerable rearward extension adjacent to the shared boundary between Woodland View and The Oakes.
4. In the main issue of my appeal decision, I set out the reasons why this extension would not result in unacceptable effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of The Oakes in respect to outlook, privacy and light. This is because of a combination of factors - facets of the proposed design and of the layout, orientation and arrangement of Woodland View and The Oakes which means that the ensuing effects would be sufficiently mitigated.
5. However, this is a matter of judgement. Although I do not agree with it, the opposing view that the development's inclusion of an extension adopting the scale and positioning of that proposed would result in unacceptably harmful effects is not an unreasonable conclusion to draw.
6. In addition, it is clear from the minutes provided that Planning Committee Members were presented with a verbal summary of the key matters relevant to the development, heard statements from both the appellant and the occupiers of The Oakes, whilst some Members also undertook a site visit. This all indicates to me that the Council's decision to refuse planning permission was informed by a range of factors. Consequently, I have no firm basis on which to conclude that the

Council's decision to refuse the application was unduly founded on an image circulated to Members or based on vague or inaccurate assertions about the development's impacts. Overall, I am satisfied that the Council have produced sufficient evidence to substantiate its reason for refusal.

7. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

H Jones

INSPECTOR