



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 24th July 2025

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11th June 2025 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillors Bright, Cairns (substitute for Hasthorpe), Dawkins (substitute for Pettigrew), Emmerson, Goodwin (substitute for Kaczmarek) Hudson, Humphrey, Mickleburgh, and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

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

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Augusta (Park Ward Councillor)

There were 16 members of the public and one member of the press present.

P.1 APPPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

It was noted that at the Annual General Meeting of the Council held on 22nd May 2025, Councillor Hasthorpe had been appointed Chairman and Councillor Pettigrew had been appointed Deputy Chairman of this Committee for the Municipal Year 2025/2026.

P.2 APPPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THIS MEETING

RESOLVED – That Councillor Hudson be appointed as Chair for this meeting of the Planning Committee.

COUNCILLOR HUDSON IN THE CHAIR

P.3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received for this meeting from Councillors Hasthorpe, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Parkinson and Pettigrew.

P.4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bright declared an other registerable interest in P.4 Item 1 DM/0770/23/FUL as he had submitted a written representation in objection to the application.

Councillor Emmerson declared an other registerable in P.4 Item 3 DM/1029/24/FUL as he had previously objected to the application when he was a member of Laceby Parish Council.

Councillor Humphrey declared a pecuniary interest in P.4 Item 1 DM/0770/23/FUL, Item 2 DM/0074/25/FUL and Item 6 DM/0201/25/OUT as his spouse worked for the agent.

P.5 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

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

Item 1 - DM/0770/23/FUL - 45-47 Police Station, Princes Road, Cleethorpes

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received and due to a call in from Councillor Farren. Mr Limmer stated that a petition objecting to the application had also been received and contained 100 signatures. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Limmer said that since the publication of the agenda papers, it had been determined by the Education Lead for the Council, that there was sufficient capacity at the nearby school and therefore no education contributions were needed. He concluded that the proposed development was not acceptable regarding flood risk as it would not be safe in a flood event and therefore failed the exceptions test. Mr Limmer stated that the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mrs Lanfranchi spoke as the lead petitioner in objection to the application. She represented a group of over 100 residents. Ms Lanfranchi said that the residents were not opposed to the development of the police station and since 2023 they had attended meetings regarding the development. She explained that residents had consistently stated their support for a balanced development, but not overdevelopment. Mrs Lanfranchi said that everyone agreed that something needed to be done with the building, but there were a number of concerns residents had. She stated that flooding was a major concern for residents, and the Environment Agency had also objected to the

proposed development as it had not met the required flood mitigation measures. Mrs Lanfranchi said that the site was located in a high-risk flood area and the risk to life could not be justified by the proposed development. She said that Anglian Water had also objected to the application regarding drainage. Mrs Lanfranchi stated that she could provide photos of flooding in the area that had affected streets and showed that water also frequently pools in the car park area. She stated that the planning officer's photos also showed that. Mrs Lanfranchi said that this flooding caused damage, and the flooding was present all the way down to Poplar Road and Neptune Street. She said that when the building was vacated surface water was left and there were two areas of water. Mrs Lanfranchi said that her husband had to contact the police to find a resolution and the situation was temporarily rectified but the water reappeared in the Summer the following year where it remained for a further three months. She stated that this led to the infestation of flies and an horrendous smell. Mrs Lanfranchi said that her husband had to again contact the police and one of the areas was drained quickly but the other area was not. She said that as there were already problems with flooding, what level of disruption should residents expect to face if the application was approved without a plan.

Ms Kellet spoke in objection to the application. She said that ecology was another concern of residents. Ms Kellet stated that all bat species were protected, and it is a criminal offence to deliberately harm or disturb bats or damage their roosts. She said that she had photos which showed that bats were using the area and were not just passing through. Ms Kellet said that the bats are breeding there, and no bat survey had been shared with the community. She stated that this was not fair on residents and could lead to a fine. Ms Kellet said that the council should pause plans to ensure the protection of wildlife. She had videos of bats at the site which she could send to Planning Committee members. Ms Kellet said that parking was another concern of the community as well as highway safety and traffic management. She said that a resident's car was recently written off and they were left without transport, and this was not an isolated event. Ms Kellet stated that there were blind spots in the area and risk of accident was high. She said that more housing in the area would lead to additional vehicles and that was a safety concern. Ms Kellet said that residents had not seen any traffic mitigation plans and there was also proposed to be one parking space for each house, but some people could own more than one car. She explained that there were also issues during the summer months regarding illegal parking, congestion and cars blocking the Fire Station which risked emergency response times being impacted. Ms Kellet said that the increase in traffic would result in an increase to air pollution which would affect residents with asthma and other conditions. She said that whilst she understood privacy and property value was a minor issue in terms of planning, it was a big issue for residents. Ms Kellet said that the path that was being proposed raised serious concerns regarding privacy of people's gardens. She asked the Planning Committee to consider residents when they made their determination.

Mr Blenkinsop spoke in support of the application. He explained that he was Head of Estates for the police. Mr Blenkinsop said that there had been two break ins at the site this year and the cost of that had totalled £1,200 in repairs. He said that the premises had been empty for some time and was attracting anti-social behaviour. Mr Blenkinsop said that it cost £7000 in repairs to keep the building watertight and there were also indirect costs such as people's time in checking the building and the security. He stated that the current running costs of the building was £20,000 a year.

Mr Evison, the Police and Crime Commissioner for Humberside, spoke in support of the application. . Mr Evison said that he was technically the owner of the property. He said that the proposed development was originally submitted in 2019 and had received positive views. Mr Evison said that what was proposed was the regeneration of a listed building. He said that it had recently been broken into and vandalised. Mr Evison stated that if the application were approved, it would generate money which would be reinvested into policing and the Grimsby area. He said that the application did meet the council's one metre rule in terms of flooding and there was no log that there had been excessive flooding even though he was aware residents say there is an issue. Mr Evison said that if the application was not approved, and housing was not allowed on the site, then the site could only be used for commercial purposes.

Mr Scoffin spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the planning application was submitted in 2023 after the police had received positive feedback in 2019. Mr Scoffin said that the applicant had developed other sites and had recently completed a development in Highgate. He said that during the application process, he had liaised with the Planning Department as well as residents and ward councillors and was surprised by the recommendation of refusal. Mr Scoffin said that the site was a brownfield site which was located within a sustainable location. He said that the proposed development would provide homes for the local housing supply. Mr Scoffin said that the recommendation of refusal was due to the flood risk. He said that he had liaised with the Environment Agency who had said the model showed flooding could occur up to three metres. Mr Scoffin said that raising buildings on site by that much would impact residents and residents had also agreed that they didn't want that to happen. He said that what the applicant proposed was to raise the floor levels by one metre and the properties built in accordance with recommended flood mitigation. Mr Scoffin said that residents had also raised concerns regarding traffic and noise. He said that the amended plans showed that there would be a further six car parking spaces and another two on Poplar Road. Mr Scoffin said that the Highways Department had not supported the idea of having the access be from Poplar Road so Princes Road would have to be where the site was accessed from. He stated that there would be a Construction Traffic Management Plan agreed. Mr Scoffin said that there had been changes made to the layout to ensure appropriate separation distances, and there had also been a reduction in the mass and eaves level of plot eight and

nine. He said that the drainage strategy had been provided and accepted. Mr Scoffin said that Anglian Water had made representations, and all of their conditions had been agreed to. He stated that there would also be a Section 106 agreement in place. Mr Scoffin asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

The Chair said that there did seem to be some common ground. He said that regarding the flooding on the car park, it did seem to be that once the police were notified, it was able to be drained. The Chair said that there was potentially an issue with the drains not working. He asked officers to clarify the issue of bats at the site.

Mr Limmer responded that an ecology survey had been provided, and the council's ecology officer had recommended that further survey work regarding bats be undertaken prior to any development taking place at the site. He said that a bat survey could be added as a condition if committee members were minded to approve the application.

The Chair sought clarification that were bats to be found at the site, then mitigation would need to be put in place.

Mr Limmer confirmed that was correct.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was nice to see residents at the meeting as they clearly cared about their local area. He said that the development of a brownfield site was normally a good thing, but flood risk was a serious issue. Councillor Mickleburgh said that there did seem to be some common ground, but he was concerned that if nothing was done to the site, it would be vandalised. He said that he wouldn't support the application as it was and would instead like to see people get together to find a compromise.

Councillor Dawkins said that he thought the issue of water being on the car park was due to the drains not being in the right place. He said that he thought Princes Road was slightly higher than Poplar Road, so if Princes Road flooded so would Poplar Road. Councillor Dawkins said that the Environment Agency did go against lots of applications regarding flooding, but you didn't see that area flooded often. He said that he didn't think the traffic would be any worse as a result of the proposed development, than if the police station was still open.

The Chair stated that the residents were concerned that the issue of flooding would get worse as a result of the proposed development.

Councillor Goodwin said that raising the floor levels by a metre would help. She said that other applications had been approved that were in flood risk areas, and that the application regarding the nearby church was also approved. Councillor Goodwin proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Dixon stated that there was a distinction between surface water and tidal water. He said that the council's drainage officer thought the issue of surface water could be solved, but the Environment Agency were concerned about tidal water. Mr Dixon stated that the Environment Agency had not objected to the principle of development at the site but what was proposed. Mr Dixon stated that flooding was an important reason and the Environment Agency object for good reason.

Councillor Shutt said that flood risk was the issue. He said that with other developments, the main concern regarding flooding was the sleeping accommodation. He asked if the proposed new builds had sleeping accommodation upstairs and the floor levels raised by one metre, would that comply.

Mr Limmer said that the bedrooms for the proposed new builds would be on the first floor. He said that the part of the site where the police station was located, did slope so there was a mixture of levels.

Councillor Shutt sought clarification that in general the new builds complied.

Mr Limmer responded that they didn't as all living accommodation would need to be on the first floor and raising the floor levels by one metre would not meet the standards as required by the Environment Agency.

Councillor Shutt said that the buildings would need to more or less be skyscrapers to comply. He said that there didn't seem to be much compromise with the Environment Agency. Councillor Shutt said that he was uncomfortable with supporting the proposal to approve the application as the council could lose on appeal.

Mr Dixon said that the application couldn't be appealed in that way. He explained that the course of action would be a judicial review if residents were not happy with the determination process.

Councillor Goodwin said that the Planning Committee had approved three blocks of flats on Grant Street which were located nearer the sea.

Councillor Dawkins said that the site was on a hill, so therefore wouldn't Poplar Road flood first. He said that there had been no recent tidal floods. Councillor Dawkins said that he didn't understand how new builds built on a hill would flood but not buildings on Poplar Road.

Councillor Cairns said that he understood resident's concerns, but there was an empty building. He was sure residents' concerns could be addressed.

Councillor Emmerson said that he was undecided about the application. He said that he didn't think the proposed development would be in the right place, but he also didn't want to see buildings go to rack and ruin.

Councillor Emmerson asked whether he could propose a change to the application.

The Chair stated that he couldn't, and committee members had to consider the application as it was.

Councillor Emmerson said that he was torn regarding the application.

Mr Dixon sought clarifications on the reasons for the proposal to approve the application. He stated that based on the committee members comments, they had proposed to approve the application as it would mean the regeneration of a brownfield site and that sufficient effort had been given to overcome the objection.

Councillor Goodwin and Councillor Dawkins agreed to those reasons.

Mr Dixon stated that were the application to be resolved to be approved, he recommended that the final decision needed to be delegated back to planning officers to allow for conditions and legal agreement to be agreed and consultation with the Environment Agency on that resolution.

Councillor Goodwin and Councillor Dawkins agreed to this approach.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Bright returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 2 - DM/0074/25/FUL - 16 Dudley Street, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon said that since the publication of the agenda papers, condition three had been amended to show that the work as outlined in the condition would be completed prior to occupation. He stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that Dudley Street was a majority residential street. Mr Deakins said that the building was very large and had previously been an accountancy office with lots of vehicles entering. He said that the proposed number of bedrooms was more than what was normally seen but when you consider the detail of the application, it shows that, that number of bedrooms was appropriate. Mr Deakins stated that the proposed HMO would also be subject to a licensing application. He explained that there was other HMOs on the street. Mr Deakins said that he appreciated the comments from neighbours, but he didn't see the issues and he didn't think committee

members would be able to point out the current HMOs on the street as they work like other dwellings. He said that he didn't think a parking space was needed for every bedroom but there would be cycle spaces for each bedroom and there was also bus stops nearby. Mr Deakins said that he didn't think that many vehicular movements would occur. He said that there had been a previous application for a HMO where there was no parking, and it was refused by Planning Committee but allowed on appeal. Mr Deakins said that his client operated a number of these types of buildings on Issacs Hill and people using them didn't tend to have cars. He said that the available parking spaces would also operate on a first come, first served basis and therefore people would be aware that there would be no parking space for them if they wanted to rent one of the bedrooms. Mr Deakins stated that there was also street parking for free from 6pm onwards. He said that there would be minimal changes made to the east elevation and the building would look the same as it did currently. Mr Deakins said that the HMO would not use the Council's bin collection system due to the number involved and instead a private waste company would be used. He asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Augusta spoke as a ward councillor for the Park Ward. He said that he was speaking on behalf of the other ward councillors for Park Ward. Councillor Augusta said that what was being proposed was an eighteen-bedroom HMO which would be the largest HMO in the local authority. He said that he didn't object to development, but had issues with the application as the proposed development was overdevelopment and could lead to issues such as community cohesion and issues with parking. Councillor Augusta said that eighteen bedrooms in one building was not reasonable and was overdevelopment of the site. He said that that level of occupation would turn a single building into a hostel and that both floors would have nine bedrooms with one kitchen per floor.

Councillor Augusta stated that there was already a twelve-bedroom HMO in the area and two six-bedroom HMOs. He said that this had already increased the density of housing in the area. Councillor Augusta said that he didn't see how an eighteen-bedroom HMO was acceptable as the area was already over saturated with them. He said that there was also no private kitchen and that they would be communal with eighteen people sharing. Councillor Augusta stated that it could also mean a high turnover of people which didn't fit into the area. He said that the applicant had said that they were targeting people in their 30s – 50s who were professionals, to live in the HMO, but what was proposed sounded more like student accommodation. Councillor Augusta said that there were only six parking spaces but yet the applicant had stated they were targeting professionals in their 30s – 50s. He said that there were concerns about parking in the area and Dudley Street had double yellow lines and residents already had issues with parking. Councillor Augusta said that when the building was used as an accountancy office, residents had issues accessing their properties. He said that HMOs can attract short term tenancies and residents had raised concerns about this. Councillor Augusta said that when speaking to residents about the HMO, they fear it could damage their neighbourhood with the amount of people

that would be living in the HMO. He stated that the application undermined the National Planning Policy Framework.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he walked down Dudley Street every day and didn't know there were any HMOs down there. He said that HMOs were a cheaper form of accommodation which could suit young professionals. Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was important not to prejudice people who live in flats or HMOs. He said that the issue regarding vehicles was a red herring. Councillor Mickleburgh said that if someone was on a low income, they could not afford a car, but there were good bus services in that area. He said that the proposed development would bring a building back into use. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that he doubted the target market of professionals in their 30s-50s would want to live in an eighteen-bedroom HMO and the HMO would probably attract those on a lower income. He said that he struggled with the social aspect of the application and thought the idea of eighteen people living there failed to grasp how the proposed development could support the local community. Councillor Bright said that he thought the HMO would be more transient and would be more like an Airbnb. He asked if an HMO was considered the same classification as an Airbnb.

Mr Dixon responded that currently there was nothing to stop the HMOs being let as an Airbnb.

Councillor Bright said that he found it difficult to believe that professionals in their 30s-50s would be living in this HMO. He said that he thought it would be used by people for short terms. Councillor Bright said that he would listen to the rest of the debate, but he didn't think the application satisfied the social side of sustainable development.

Councillor Cairns said that he was concerned about fire safety.

The Chair said that fire safety would have to be addressed.

Councillor Shutt asked whether the HMO would need a licence.

Mr Dixon stated that a licence would be required.

Councillor Shutt said that the building reflected the number of bedrooms proposed. He said that people did want this type of accommodation. Councillor Shutt said that licenced HMOs were a better way forward than HMOs allowed under permitted development. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Humphrey returned to the meeting at this point.

Councillor Emmerson left the meeting at this point.

Item 3 – DM/1029/24/FUL – Astle BMW, Grimsby Road, Laceby

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

The Chair stated that there had been a big issue regarding offloading, and he was pleased to see this had been addressed with an amendment.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that the objections were concerning but they had been discussed, and alterations had been made. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt said that condition five needed to be monitored by officers. He said that he hoped condition five would alleviate the concerns of the parish council. Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Goodwin stated that condition five needed to be policed. She said that she would support the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright said that whilst the applicant had stated they would follow the delivery plan, if they failed to, then there needed to be enforcement.

The Chair agreed with members of the committee, that condition five needed to be monitored and if not adhered to, enforcement action should be taken.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Emmerson returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 4 – DM/1222/23/OUT – Land Adj. The Old Rectory, Main Road, Ashby Cum Fenby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections

received and an objection from Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Council. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Limmer stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mrs Andrews spoke as the applicant for the application. She said that her family had lived at the property since 1974. Mrs Andrews said that her parents had supported village life for many years. She stated that her mother had suffered a fall, and she originally thought her father would move out of the property, but whilst they were looking at selling the property, several people had expressed that no one would want such a large garden which came with the property. Mrs Andrews said that her mother's care was costly and was the reason she was applying for planning permission for part of the garden. She stated that this decision would keep her parents safe. Mrs Andrews said that Ashby was a desirable village where there had been development. She said that she had worked hard with the planning officers to make sure all of the requirements were met. Mrs Andrews explained that the objections related to the narrow lanes in the area, but this was the same for the entire village. She said that the proposed development would be set back on the site and would not cause overlooking. Mrs Andrews thanked the Planning Committee for their consideration.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was a straightforward application which sought planning permission for one property. He said that the proposed development would be well away from neighbouring properties. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that it was an infill development and whilst he didn't typically like infill developments, he couldn't see that there was a material planning reason to object to the application. He stated that he thought the application should be approved.

Councillor Shutt said that it was large garden area, and he didn't think anyone would have objected to the proposed development had it been built at the time of the other property. He stated that he saw no issues with the application. Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Humphrey said that he wondered whether some of the objections would be withdrawn now as they were submitted when two dwellings were proposed, rather than the one that was currently proposed. He said that he saw no reason to refuse the application. Councillor Humphrey asked whether if the outline application was approved, would the reserved matters application automatically come before the Planning Committee.

The Chair stated that it would not and would only come before the Planning Committee if it was objected to by residents, the parish council or if a ward councillor called the application in.

Councillor Emmerson said that when he initially looked at the application, he was opposed to it but after listening to the applicant, his mind had been changed. He said that various infill developments had been approved in Humberston Avenue, and this was an infill development which was very reasonable.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 8 for and 0 against with one abstention for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 5 – DM/0221/25/FUL – Waltham Gateway Academy, Sunningdale, Waltham

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

Ms Scott spoke as the applicant for the application. She said that she was Pupil Place Manager for North East Lincolnshire Council. Ms Scott said that the planning application was for temporary mobile units and use of these temporary mobile units was always intended if there were delays. She stated that the building would not be ready in time for the start of the September 2025 term, and this was why the temporary mobile units were needed. Ms Scott said that the building would be ready by the October half term period and children would then use the building on their return to school after half term. She said that 25 children would use the temporary mobile units. Ms Scott said that the site had been inspected by Ofsted in June and there had also been meetings with the leaders of the Gateway Academy Trust. She stated that Ofsted were happy with the plans and raised no concerns.

Councillor Dawkins said that what was proposed was a short-term solution. He said that he saw no reason to object to the application and proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal to approve the application. He said that the temporary mobile units would only be used for a matter of months and would allow the children to still be able to attend school on their doorstep.

Councillor Bright was in agreement with Councillor Dawkins and Councillor Mickleburgh. He said that the Traffic Regulation Order should alleviate any concerns.

Councillors Emmerson and Shutt also supported the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Humphrey left the meeting at this point.

Item 6 – DM/0201/25/OUT – Rear Of 10 Great Coates Road, Healing

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee as the proposed development was a departure from the Council's Local Plan as a proportion of it was outside the development boundary. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Limmer stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that development had been approved in the area that was also outside of the development boundary, and this was approved when there was a five year supply of housing. Mr Deakins said that as long as the proposed development did not intrude any further than the neighbouring properties had, and with some careful planning and edge landscaping, then the proposed development would sit comfortably in the setting. He stated that there had been no objections from any technical consultees. Mr Deakins said that what was proposed was a good scheme and would be located in a sustainable location.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that the proposed development would be located only slightly out of the local plan. He stated that there were no objections. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright stated that he saw no reason to refuse the application.

Councillor Shutt sought clarification on what the speed limit was in the area.

Mr Brockbank clarified that the speed limit was 30mph.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Humphrey returned to the meeting at this point.

P.6 PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure under delegated powers during the period 11th April 2025 – 29th May 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.7 PLANNING APPEALS

The committee received a report from the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure regarding outstanding planning appeals.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.8 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded for the following business on the grounds that its discussion was likely to disclose exempt information within paragraph 6 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

P.9 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

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

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

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 11.55am.