



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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6th August 2025 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (Chair)

Councillors Bright, Emmerson, Hudson, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Mickleburgh, Parkinson, Pettigrew and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Richard Limmer (Senior Town Planner)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Hannah Steer (Solicitor)
- Tracy Lovejoy (Locum Lawyer)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

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

P.17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received for this meeting from Councillor Humphrey.

P.18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bright declared a pecuniary interest in P.19 Item 1 DM/0173/24/FUL as he had submitted an objection to the application.

P.19 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Councillor Bright left the meeting at this point.

Item 1 - DM/0173/24/FUL - Plot 105, Humberston Fitties, Humberston.

Mr Dixon stated that the appeal decision for DM/0778/22/FUL should have been included in the agenda papers as it was cited in the officer's report for the current application. He stated that a copy had now been provided to all committee members, but he thought it would be appropriate to allow them time to read that appeal decision as they hadn't had time prior to the meeting due to it not being included in the agenda papers.

The Chair allowed committee members time to read the appeal decision.

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

Mr Collett spoke in objection to the application. He said that on 29th March 2023, the Planning Committee voted against the officer's recommendation and refused an application regarding Plot 80. Mr Collett stated that Plot 105 was 30 metres away from Plot 80. He said that at that meeting, committee members spoke about the uniqueness of the Humberston Fitties. He referred to individual member comments about vacant plots not being used, the potential loss of green space and the importance of listening to residents. He said that all the committee members had voted against that application for Plot 80 with one abstention. Mr Collett queried what had changed since then. He said that there were eleven plots, but they were being submitted as single applications as eleven new chalets would be seen as a major development if submitted altogether. Mr Collett said that officers had mentioned caravans being able to be on the plot, but it was not a given that this would happen. He said that some of the plots where caravans had been, had had enforcement cases against them for breaching licensing conditions. Mr Collett said that the officer's report referred to the sustainability benefits of the proposed development, but the Exceptions Test was not about choosing the least bad option. He stated that the appeal regarding the application for Plot 80 had also been dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate, who stated in the decision that the proposed chalet was not a replacement chalet, the "appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole" and there were "no material considerations of sufficient weight, including the policies of the Framework, to indicate the decision should be made otherwise". Mr Collett stated that he hoped the Planning Committee would uphold that same commitment.

Mr Scoffin spoke as the agent for the application. He said that Plot 105 was a vacant plot, but the plot used to have a chalet on it in the 1980s based on ordnance survey maps. Mr Scoffin said that the current

planning application was the result of two years of work and a Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted. He said that a Sequential Test had also been needed, and the details of these assessments had been agreed with both planning officers and legal officers, and this was outlined in the officer's report. Mr Scoffin said that planning applications for Plot 176 had been approved and replacement chalets for 124 and 268 Humberston Fitties had also been approved. He stated that the council's drainage officer had raised no objection to the application, subject to a percolation test. Mr Scoffin said that the North East Lindsey Drainage Board had also not objected to the application but had raised the issue of ground floor bedrooms, although this had already been identified in the Flood Risk Assessment. He said that the council's heritage officer had also raised no objection to the application and neither had the emergency planning officer. The council's trees and woodlands officer had raised no objection to the landscaping scheme. He said that Natural England had not submitted a comment about the application. Mr Scoffin said that the objections refer to Plot 105 as a green space, but it was a vacant plot. He noted that there was the option to have caravans on the plot due to a planning permission decision from 1992. Mr Scoffin stated that the proposed chalet conformed to the Humberston Fitties Design Guide. He asked that the application be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh thought it was good that residents expressed their concerns. He said that he was confused as on one hand, officers had done some good work regarding the application for a new chalet but on the other hand, some of the residents didn't like the application and weren't happy. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Hudson said that all applications were judged on their own merits. He said that the application for Plot 80 was refused by the Planning Committee, and the appeal was also dismissed, but the difference with this plot was that it had had a previous chalet on it.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he was surprised that the Environment Agency had not raised any concerns outside of the one condition they required regarding occupancy. He said that there had been lots of development around the specific plot and he couldn't think of any reason as to why the Planning Committee wouldn't approve the application. Councillor Kaczmarek said that years of hard work had gone into the application, and he thought that the applicant had tried to get the best out of the plot. He said that he was minded to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he understood the concerns of residents. He said that Mr Scoffin had said the plot had been built on before, but he wasn't sure if that was true or not. Councillor Shutt said that he also understood the officer's point about caravans being able to be on the site. He asked whether the point raised by Mr Collett about enforcement was true.

Mr Dixon responded that the Environment Agency were consistent regarding proposed new chalets on the Humberston Fitties and their view was that the best way to mitigate against tidal risk was through an occupancy condition restricting the occupancy during the months November – March. He stated that the Environment Agency did consider applications in detail. Mr Dixon said that in terms of whether there had been a chalet on the site previously, that was not relevant to the current application as a chalet was not there now and that planning chapter had closed. The application needed to be determined on how things were at present and whether it was right for a chalet to be on the plot. He stated that caravans being on the site would be lawful. Mr Dixon said that the planning enforcement investigation was not in relation to the caravans but in relation to operational development such as some of the decking installed.

Councillor Lindley said that there was no mention of the plot's history in the officer's report which meant that committee members could only assume, and they should never just assume anything. He said that he thought there potentially did used to be a chalet on the site as the numbering of the chalets went from 103 to 107, but there was nothing to say there definitely used to be a chalet on the plot. Councillor Lindley said that he disagreed with Mr Dixon in that he thought that whether a chalet used to be on the plot was relevant to the current application. He said that there were similarities with Plot 105 and Plot 80 as they were both located within flood zone 3A, but no Sequential Test was needed for the Plot 80 application, however, it was for the current application for Plot 105. Councillor Lindley said that the main question was whether Plot 105 was an appropriate place for a chalet to be and the history of Plot 105 should have been included in the officer's report. He said that he thought there was a flood risk and Plot 105 was not so far away from Plot 80. Councillor Lindley said that he was minded to refuse the application. He said that he would not want to approve an application when not all the information was in front of him. Councillor Lindley asked what made the current application any different to the application for Plot 80 which was refused. He said that he was uncomfortable with approving the application but would listen to the debate.

Councillor Emmerson said that it was a delicate subject in a delicate area. He said that the Humberston Fitties was a conservation area which had a lot of history. Councillor Emmerson thought the proposed development would stand out, and if approved, would open the door to approving other plots. He said that it could lead to the mass modernisation of the Humberston Fitties. Councillor Emmerson said that neighbours would be the ones who had to live with that. He stated that he was minded to refuse the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that it was a difficult application to consider, as applications usually were for the Humberston Fitties. He said that when he looked solely at the proposed chalet, it ticked all the boxes, but when he considered the whole site of the Humberston Fitties he wasn't sure if the proposed development would be overdevelopment or would have a

detrimental impact. Councillor Pettigrew said that he was very conflicted but was minded to refuse the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he knew the Humberston Fitties well. He didn't think the proposed development would lead to a loss of character or loss of identity. Councillor Parkinson said that the proposed chalet had a good design, and the proposed materials were good, and he thought the proposed chalet would merge in. He believed that the plot was previously built on and if there was a previous chalet on the plot and this was shown on an ordnance survey map, that was pretty definitive. Councillor Parkinson said that in terms of flood risk, the Humberston Fitties was closed for part of the year which mitigated the flood risk. He was minded to approve the application. Councillor Parkinson said that there was a lot of objections to the application, but he thought they were emotive and not necessarily planning objections.

Councillor Shutt said that regarding the enforcement action taking place, it was for the decking and not the actual caravans. He felt that, with caravans, the council had less control than if there was a chalet built instead. Councillor Shutt said that if the space was anywhere else, he thought it would be developed. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said tidal flood risk was not only a risk during the closed season. He said that areas were seeing unpredictable weather patterns throughout the year and the Humberston Fitties was constantly a flood risk. Councillor Lindley said that it was naïve to think that only between January and March was there a risk of flooding. He stated that Plot 105 and Plot 80 were both located in flood zone 3A. Councillor Lindley said that he would not be supporting the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he didn't think what was proposed was overdevelopment and he thought there would have been an intention to have something on the plot. He said that the proposed chalet would look newer to the surrounding ones, but he didn't think it would look out of place. Councillor Kaczmarek seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson commented that not all residents were against the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh agreed with Councillor Lindley that we were getting different storms and weather patterns. He stated that he would not be supporting the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Emmerson had concerns about the design of the chalet, overlooking and the loss of privacy. He was concerned about the windows, and it appeared to him that there would be a loss of light for neighbours. Councillor Emmerson felt that the proposed chalet would

look shoved in and would have a detrimental impact on the neighbours on both sides.

Councillor Parkinson said that a condition had also been agreed that the proposed chalet only be used for a ten-year period which was a big ask for someone to agree to. He said that flood mitigation measures would be in place. Councillor Parkinson proposed that a site visit take place as he thought it would be useful for the Planning Committee to view both Plot 105 and Plot 80.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal for a site visit to take place.

The Chair used his discretion to take the site visit motion to a vote before the approval motion.

The Planning Committee took a vote and upon a vote, 3 voted for a site visit to take place and six voted against.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for and 4 against for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Councillor Bright returned to the meeting.

Item 2 - DM/0077/25/FUL - Bull Rush Lakes, Tetney Road, Humberston.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from a ward councillor. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed development had failed both the Sequential Test and the Exceptions Test and would present an undue risk of flooding. He said that the Environment Agency had objected to the application. Mr Limmer said that the design of the proposed development was also considered to be a visual intrusion on the open countryside at the detriment to the character of the area. Mr Limmer stated that the application was recommended for refusal, but as additional consultation was needed, it was recommended that the issuing of the decision be delegated back to the Assistant Director of Regeneration, subject to no significant additional planning issues being raised.

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the site was now an established commercial enterprise. Mr Snowden said that anglers slept on site and the applicant sought to build a holiday lodge to include landscaping to provide them with sleeping accommodation and other facilities. Mr Snowden stated that there were examples of similar facilities in the area such as Laceby Manor and Willow Lakes. He said that the application had been recommended for refusal due to the

objection from the Environment Agency (EA) and for not passing the Sequential and Exceptions Tests. Mr Snowden said that the planning officer had stated that other sites in the area could be used for such facilities, but the applicant owned this site. He said that detailed maps showed that the proposed holiday lodge would be outside of the flood zone area on the EA maps. Mr Snowden said that there had been concerns about the design of the proposed holiday lodge, in that it looked like a residential dwelling. He said that the design of the proposed holiday lodge was a similar design to other holiday lodges. Mr Snowden said that the council's ecology officer and council's trees and woodlands officer had raised no objection to the application. He stated that there would be a ten percent biodiversity net gain at the site as a result of the proposed development. Mr Snowden said that he believed that the proposed holiday lodge would not negatively impact the area. He stated that the anglers did currently sleep on site. Mr Snowden said that the proposed holiday lodge would bring more tourism into the area.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of the Ward Councillor, Councillor Shreeve for both P.18 Item 2 DM/0077/25/FUL and Item 3 DM/0317/25/FUL.

Councillor Shreeve believed that the Environment Agency had reservations about flood plain and that whilst that was understood, all ward councillors had attended the site and were satisfied that the levels of the proposed development were significantly above both the adjoining ditch/dyke and the fishing lakes on site.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that there was a lot about flooding in the officer's report. He stated that officers didn't recommend that an application be refused on a whim. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he understood why the fishermen wanted to stay at the site, but he was unsure about the proposed two storey holiday lodge.

Councillor Hudson said that he was not concerned about the flood risk as the proposed holiday lodge would be on higher ground, but he was concerned about the impact on the open countryside. He said that were someone to ask to build a house in this area, the Planning Committee would say no and what was proposed was essentially a house. Councillor Hudson said that if the proposed holiday lodge was single storey, that might have been better. He said that when people go fishing, they liked to stay in tents and if they did want to stay in a holiday lodge, there were other places such as Willow Lakes where they could do so. Councillor Hudson stated that the open countryside element of the application was not right. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Bright said that the flood risk was high and whilst he understood the ward councillor had been to the site, they hadn't assessed the site. He said that the proposed holiday lodge would also be outside of the development boundary. Councillor Bright seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Shutt said that the proposed holiday lodge looked more like a house than a holiday lodge. He said that he was expecting the proposed holiday lodge to be one storey. Councillor Shutt said that he thought the proposed holiday lodge would be out of place and he would support the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he had concerns about any decision being made regarding the application when the consultation period had not ended and that any decision could be more vulnerable to appeal as a result. He said that he thought the Planning Committee should hold off making a decision and defer the application to allow for the consultation period to end.

Mr Dixon explained that it was Tetney Parish Council that they were awaiting comments from. He said that if there were any material changes as a result of their comments, then the application would be brought back before the Planning Committee. Mr Dixon stated that was the usual process.

Councillor Pettigrew said that flood risk needed to be taken seriously due to the environment changes. He also agreed about the concerns raised regarding design and the impact on the open countryside.

Councillor Parkinson said that if there was a flood, people would rather be in the proposed holiday lodge. He found the Sequential Test confusing regarding the suggestion that the proposed holiday lodge could be sited elsewhere.

Mr Dixon responded that the Sequential Test was specific in the framework. He said that ownership of land was not a reason to deviate from the Sequential Test and in considering the test, the council had to consider the whole area. Mr Dixon stated that the flood risk for the specific area was the highest risk.

Councillor Lindley thought the design of the proposed development was wrong, and it shouldn't be two storeys. He said that it would also be isolated, and the application ticked all the boxes for being refused.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Item 3 – DM/0317/25/FUL – Bull Rush Lakes, Tetney Road, Humberston.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from a ward councillor. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Limmer said that the proposed development had failed the Sequential

Test and it was considered that it would present an undue impact in terms of flood risk. He stated that the Environment Agency had objected to the application. Mr Limmer said that the application was recommended for refusal, but as additional consultation was needed, it was recommended that the issuing of the decision be delegated back to the Assistant Director of Regeneration subject to no significant additional planning issues being raised.

Ms Redburn spoke as the agent for the application. She said that the ward councillors were happy to put forward the application. Ms Redburn said that the application had been recommended for refusal due to flood risk but there had been no other objections. She said that the anglers would book in for several days and the site containers allowed for them to make lunch, get changed and sleep on site. Ms Redburn said that as part of the Sequential Test, planning officers had outlined that other sites could be used for such development as they were of lower risk of flooding, but this site was an established fishing site. She said that the containers would be outside of the hazard area of flooding. Ms Redburn added that the site was at a higher level. She said that there had been some concerns raised regarding the structure being in the open countryside, but green cladding had been used which fitted in. Ms Redburn noted that the planning officer did not consider the containers to be detrimental. She believed the impact of the containers on the rural character of the area was acceptable. Ms Redburn said that the applicant had also organised for younger anglers to visit the site, and they would also be using the facilities. She stated that the applicant was willing to remove the sleeping accommodation aspect of the application if committee members were minded to approve the application but didn't agree with that aspect.

The Chair stated that the ward councillor, Councillor Shreeve's statement on the previous item also pertained to the current application.

Councillor Hudson said that the current application was very different to the previous application. He said that he didn't think that what was proposed would negatively impact the countryside. Councillor Hudson said that he was unsure about the sleeping accommodation aspect, but he was not sure if it was much worse than a sleeping bag.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he thought the application should be refused due to the flood risk. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he thought the anglers would benefit from the facilities, but he didn't think the containers should be used for sleeping. He seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Bright said that the store and facilities were fine, and he wanted the business to do well, but he didn't think the containers should have sleeping accommodation. He said that he thought the application if

it came back before the Planning Committee with the sleeping accommodation aspect removed would be acceptable.

Mr Dixon said that Ms Redburn had indicated that the applicant would be happy to remove the sleeping accommodation aspect of the application and he therefore thought that if that was the case, then the Environment Agency would be happy with the application. He said that were the application to be deferred, that amendment could be made, and the Environment Agency could then be re-consulted.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be deferred in order to allow the applicant time to make the changes to the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that surely sleeping lower to the ground was more dangerous and in that case, the current application was more of a concern than the previous item (DM/0077/25/FUL).

Mr Dixon responded that was the issue that committee members had to consider. He said that were the sleeping accommodation aspect to be removed from the application, then the container would just be used for amenity.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to defer the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred.

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

Item 4 – DM/0207/25/FUL – 309 Louth Road, Grimsby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee as it was a departure from the local plan as the site was located outside the development boundary for Grimsby. 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 Snowden spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the application was a resubmission of a previously approved application. Mr Snowden said that the applicant was a local developer who has been busy working on other sites and this current application would allow him more time. He said that the site was currently used for residential purposes and this would continue. Mr Snowden said that the applicant had sought to minimise any impact on the area by proposing bungalows. He said that the council's highways officer was supportive of the application. Mr Snowden stated that the application site was not located within a flood zone and was in a sustainable area. He asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he thought that the application was a positive proposal. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Parkinson asked if the design had been improved.

Mr Limmer said that the design was the same as when it was previously approved.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was happy with the application. He asked whether the Council could demonstrate a five-year supply of housing at the time of when it was previously approved.

Mr Limmer responded that the Council couldn't at the time it was previously approved.

Councillor Parkinson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that he saw no reason to not support the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Lindley said that the site had good access, and he was happy to support the proposal of approval.

Councillor Bright said that the proposed development was fine. He said that he was not happy that the site was located outside of the development boundary, but he understood that that was due to the housing supply.

Councillor Shutt said that he was happy to support the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Emmerson thought the proposed development would fit in. He said that there were also no objections from the highways officer.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 5 – DM/0981/24/FULA- 51 Taylors Avenue, Cleethorpes

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

Councillor Parkinson said that he had called the application in as it had been recommended for refusal previously. He said that the one good

thing about retrospective applications was that you were able to see the works. Councillor Parkinson said that the boundary wall was twenty-five feet away from the slip road and he thought it was of an appropriate height. He said that the pillars had also been reduced in height. Councillor Parkinson said that there had been no objections raised by neighbours. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that he was not a fan of retrospective applications but in this particular case, you were able to see that the boundary wall was of a really good design and a good choice of materials had been used. He said that the boundary wall looked like it was a part of the original build and was very pleasing to the eye. Councillor Lindley seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Dixon said that it didn't need to be an adopted highway in terms of permitted development considerations.

Councillor Parkinson asked whether a slip road was considered a highway.

Mr Dixon responded that any road used by vehicular traffic could be classed as a highway in terms of permitted development considerations.

Councillor Emmerson said that the brickwork that had been used for the wall was near enough the same as the brickwork used on the house. He said that he liked that fencing had been incorporated within the wall. Councillor Emmerson said that the wall boundary had provided privacy for the homeowner. He stated that he would support the proposal of approval.

Councillor Hudson said that the wall boundary was a good design and would give the applicant privacy.

Councillor Bright was happy to support the proposal of approval.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he usually didn't like retrospective applications. He said that the boundary wall looked fine, but he did query whether it was overbearing or too near a highway.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 6 – DM/0356/25/FUL – Springfield, Waltham Road, Brigsley

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from a ward councillor. He referred committee members to the supplementary agenda as the applicant had provided some further documents. Mr Dixon

outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He said that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the street scene, wider character of the area and the neighbour's residential amenity. Mr Dixon stated that the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Tutill spoke as the agent for the application. He said that what was proposed was a modest but vital upgrade to the property which would allow the occupants to remain in the village. Mr Tutill said that he believed the officer's recommendation of refusal to be disproportionate. He said that the proposed increase in the roof height would not harm the street scene and was in keeping with the area. Mr Tutill said that nearby ridge heights were higher than what had been proposed. He said that policy twenty-two of the local plan called for good design and what had been proposed met that standard. Mr Tutill said that there would be no side facing windows which could cause overlooking. He said that the proposed development didn't create additional bedrooms, and the property would remain a three-bedroom house. Mr Tutill said that the application had not received any objections. He explained that the applicant had lived in the area for years and the proposed development was not about profit and was instead about giving a growing family the space they needed. Mr Tutill said that the application did align with policy five of the local plan. He asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he had called it in on behalf of residents. He said that there had also been no objections from residents or the parish council. Councillor Pettigrew said that he would listen to debate.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was inclined to support the application. He said that the property was smaller than the ones around it and he didn't think the proposed development would harm the street scene. Councillor Mickleburgh said that if neighbours were opposed to the application they would have written in. He said that the parish council had also not objected.

Councillor Lindley said that he had recently visited the specific area, and he had seen that all of the dwellings were different, which was nice to see. He said that he disagreed with the officer's conclusion in the report that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the street scene. Councillor Lindley said that he thought the proposed development would enhance the street scene. He thought the proposed development had a good design and no objections had been received. Councillor Lindley was struggling to see how the Planning Committee could oppose the application as he didn't see that it would have a detrimental impact. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that the building looked tired, and he thought that what was proposed would completely change the outlook. He said that officers were against the application, but committee members seemed to

like it. Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Bright had a reservation regarding the neighbouring property. He didn't think the proposed development would look bad from the street scene. Councillor Bright said that the neighbour hadn't objected to the application. He was inclined to support the proposal of approval but would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Parkinson said that he liked to see a varied street scene. He said that his concerns were that as it was semi-detached property, the proposed development could create an imbalance between the two properties. Councillor Parkinson asked if Mr Tutill could be asked to explain whether the neighbour at the neighbouring property was also planning to develop their property.

The Chair said that the application needed to be considered on its own merits.

Councillor Parkinson said that he thought the proposed development would make the property unbalanced when compared to the neighbouring property. He said that he would not be supporting the proposal of approval.

Councillor Emmerson said that the property was looking a little tired, and the properties around it were modernising. He said that he would normally think that the property would stick out like a sore thumb but didn't in this case. Councillor Emmerson stated that there had also been no objections raised from neighbours.

Councillor Shutt said that he was leaning towards supporting the proposal of approval.

Councillor Lindley said that Councillor Parkinson has raised concerns about the street scene but there were no objections from the parish council or the neighbours. He stated that the Planning Committee was not to judge an application on their own personal liking.

Mr Dixon stated that the Planning Committee were to consider impacts on neighbouring amenity when determining applications. He said that there were various reasons why a person might not object to an application and that whether objections were received by neighbours or not, officers always considered neighbouring amenity.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was not going to support the proposal of approval as he thought the proposed development would affect the street scene.

The Chair asked Councillor Lindley and Councillor Hudson to clarify their reasons for the proposal of approval.

Mr Dixon outlined that based on the comments made, the reasons for the proposal of approval were that the proposed development would not be out of character with the area, was a good design and was in keeping with the surrounding area. Mr Dixon sought clarification that they were happy that there would not be a detrimental impact on the neighbour's residential amenity.

Councillor Lindley said that he was, as the neighbour hadn't objected to the application.

Mr Dixon reiterated that whether a neighbour objects to an application or not, neighbouring amenity still needed to be considered.

Councillor Lindley and Councillor Hudson agreed with the reasons outlined and that they thought there wouldn't be an adverse impact on neighbour's residential amenity.

Councillor Lindley stated that the proposed development would also be proportionate to the buildings around it.

Mr Limmer outlined proposed conditions were the application to be approved.

Councillor Lindley and Councillor Hudson agreed to the conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 7 for and 2 against with one abstention for the application to be approved.)

P.20 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 1st July 2025 - 23rd July 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.21 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.22 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.23 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

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

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

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 12.10pm.