



PLANNING COMMITTEE

1st October 2025 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Emmerson, Holland (substitute for Bright), Hudson, Humphrey, 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)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Tracy Lovejoy (Locum Lawyer)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Harness (Humberston and New Waltham Ward Councillor)

There were ten members of the public and no members of the press present.

P.31 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.32 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Humphrey declared a pecuniary interest in P.33 Item 3 DM/0599/25/FUL and Item 4 DM/0357/25/ADV as his spouse worked for the agent.

Item 1 - DM/0435/25/FUL – 240 Station Road New Waltham

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it had been originally brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received as well as an objection from New Waltham Parish Council. He said that the application had been deferred at a previous meeting to allow for engagement to take place with neighbours, the ward councillors and Children's Services and this had now taken place. Mr Limmer outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement from Mr Wilde in objection to the application.

Mr Wilde wrote that since the last meeting; two members of Keys Group had visited him. Councillor Harness had also been present for most of that meeting. Mr Wilde wrote that the members of Keys Group had assured him that children similar to those described on their website, would not be housed at the property and they would aim to house local children where possible. He wrote that he had also been informed that there would be noise at the property such as shouting, especially during the settling in of a new resident. Mr Wilde wrote that he appreciated the honesty of the staff member disclosing that. He wrote that he still objected to the application on the grounds of road safety, noise, nuisance and potential anti-social behaviour. Mr Wilde wrote that this would be the fourth care home between Cardiff Avenue and the Toll Bar roundabouts. He had mentioned at the previous meeting the amount that Keys Group charged the council for housing a child at their Waltham Road home and he still believed that care homes for children should be run by the council and not private companies, especially those owned by private equity firms. Mr Wilde wrote that committee members may have seen the recent report by the National Audit Office which was front page news on the BBC website three weeks ago and that report stated that councils spend an average of £318,400 per year, on each child, that were placed in a private care home. The report concluded that these huge sums did not offer value for money. Mr Wilde wrote that Keys Group had also made the news in 2022 following a damning Ofsted inspection at one of its other homes. He wrote that committee members had asked for more information to be supplied regarding the working relationship that Keys Group had with the council and Children Services. Mr Wilde wrote that this had been reported as positive, which surprised him as there was only one care home in this area that was run by Keys Group, so there was not much to go on. He wrote that the latest Ofsted report for the care home on Waltham Road stated that the effectiveness of leaders and managers was requiring improvement to be good. Mr Wilde wrote that he had provided examples of locations which he

believed to be more suitable for children care homes and hopefully the committee members would agree that 240 Station Road was not the right place.

Ms Carter spoke on behalf of the applicant. She said that Keys Group wished to sincerely apologise for the oversight on the lack of consultation. Ms Carter said that since the last meeting, they had consulted with a ward councillor and the direct neighbour to the property via telephone and face to face discussion. She said that she was happy to report that the ward councillor now understood the application more and had gained reassurance from us on how well our other children's home was managed and the lack of negative impact on the community. Ms Carter said that as detailed in the planning officers report at the last meeting, Children's Services considered the proposed location suitable to support the needs of the children's home in terms of space, functionality and overall suitability for residential care. She said that Children's Services supported the provision of a children's home for two children as it fitted with the needs of the children. Ms Carter said that Keys Group would continue to develop their excellent working relationship with Children's Services. She said that the consultation with the immediate neighbour had taken place, and he had stated that he was acting on behalf of the other neighbours and would feedback to them. Ms Carter said that whilst the immediate neighbour still had some concerns about the application, Keys Group had hopefully alleviated some of his concerns and some of the miscommunications about the children and young people who would reside in the home. She said that contact details had also been shared with the neighbour, and they would keep him updated as they sought to build a positive relationship with the community. Ms Carter said that all Keys Group children's homes were subject to location risk assessments as required by Ofsted and impact risk assessments were also carried out for each child. She said that the Highways Department supported the application. Ms Carter said that the management of the children's home would fall under the responsibility of Keys Group, and it was in their interest to aspire to the highest standards and operate effectively given that Ofsted which undertake regular inspections oversaw the registration of all residential homes. She asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Harness spoke as a ward councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He said that he wanted to thank the Planning Committee for deferring the application as it enabled consultation to take place. Councillor Harness said that a meeting had taken place, and he had learnt a lot about the application and Keys Group. He said that the residents were not for turning and still objected to the application. Councillor Harness stated that he supported residents.

Councillor Lindley said that he thought deferring the application at the last meeting was the right decision as there had been a lack of consultation. He said that issue had now been addressed to some degree and the applicant had gone some way to reassure residents. Councillor Lindley said that the proposed children's home would be for

two children, and in a normal family home you could also see two children living there. He said that he thought the noise in the area would be the same and there would be the same amount of traffic. Councillor Lindley stated that he would be very surprised if there was a spike in anti-social behaviour due to the proposed children's home. He said that Children's Services had reiterated that they supported the application and had confirmed they have a relationship with the provider. Councillor Lindley said that he would have been happy to approve the application at the last meeting, but the consultation was missing, and he hoped that had now been addressed. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he agreed with Councillor Lindley. He said that people did sometimes have an image of an old Victorian style institution when they thought of a children's home, but this was a five-bedroom house which would be used as a children's home for two children. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he agreed with the objector about the council managing children's homes and ideally that should be the case. He said that the costs referred to by the objector were high. Councillor Mickleburgh said that the proposed children's home would hopefully reduce costs as it would be a local children's home rather than a children's home out of area. He said that the only reason the application wasn't approved at the last meeting was due to the issues around consultation and that had now been addressed. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Holland said that the concerns of residents had to be listened to. He said that the planning statement outlined that there would be two children at the children's home and a minimum of two care staff at the premise, which given that ratio of staff to children, he didn't see the problems feared by residents coming to fruition as there was enough management on site to manage any issues. Councillor Holland said that he was minded to support the proposal of approving the application. He said that he did have concerns regarding the profit margins of private providers, but that was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor Parkinson said that he agreed with most of what had been said. He said that Children Services had less control when a children's home was managed by an outside provider. Councillor Parkinson said that there was no evidence that the children living in the home would be children from North East Lincolnshire. He said that what was proposed was a commercial exercise, but he was in favour of the application. Councillor Parkinson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 2 - DM/0175/25/OUT – Land South Side of Humberston Avenue, North East Lincolnshire

Mr Limmer 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 Limmer said that if the application were approved, the applicant's proposed condition fifteen would need to be amended as it was considered that eight weeks was not a reasonable time to properly market the dwellings and instead the condition should be amended to six months to allow for appropriate marketing opportunities. He referred committee members to the supplementary agenda which outlined that condition four as outlined in the officer's report needed to be amended as a Construction Management Statement had now been provided. Mr Limmer stated that it was recommended that the application be approved with conditions and delegated back to the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure in order for the Section 106 agreement and Unilateral Undertaking agreement to be updated and signed and for conditions to be amended.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement from Mr Foreman in objection to the application.

Mr Foreman wrote that the current application not only completely altered the whole basis upon which the original application was skilfully presented but also significantly increased the number of houses to be built on the site. He wrote that the reason for the variation was purely financial, and the consequences were so far reaching that it amounted to a full planning application cleverly disguised as an application to vary a single condition. Mr Foreman wrote that work had been going on at the site for a considerable time and to his untutored eye and viewed from the footpath alongside the development, the ground works and infrastructure seem to have been carried out to the so far unapproved plan. He wrote that if he was right about that it demonstrated an arrogant disregard for the planning process. Mr Foreman wrote that as far as he was aware, no consideration had been given by the developer to the significant changes in the area and there had been much development alongside and behind the properties on Humberston Avenue and he believed there had been problems with sewage and water disposal. He wrote that when the original application was granted there were numerous conditions imposed and in light of the issues raised, if the current application were to be granted all of these conditions should be revisited and revised where necessary to take account of the present position and formally incorporated in the consent as varied. Mr Foreman said that he appreciated the developer needed to make a profit but at the same time there was an obligation on the planning authority to look back at the original application. He wrote that the older people who had bought properties did so on the promise that more than fifty percent of their neighbours would be of a generally similar age. Mr Foreman asked that there be a compromise and that the original layout plan be retained but the percentage of older people's dwellings be reduced and the siting of those houses be designated, thus creating an area where older residents

could feel comfortable. He felt that would answer the developers need to create a more marketable development whilst at the same time preserving the original size and overall character of the site. Mr Foreman wrote that all the original safeguards would still be in place, and this would be a solution more appropriate to a variation of the original planning permission than a new application in disguise. He wrote that the application was to remove the condition requiring in excess of fifty percent of the dwellings to be for over fifty-fives and he believed this gave the Planning Committee powers to remove the condition completely or vary the percentage of over fifty-fives homes. Mr Foreman wrote that to take account of the fact that homes had been sold on the promise of the majority of the owners being over the age of fifty-five, at least a significant proportion of over fifty-fives residencies should be retained. He wrote that the developers had submitted a revised layout and, on that layout, it showed a significant increase in the number of dwellings to be expected and nowhere that he could see had any application to vary the layout or increase the density been submitted. Mr Foreman wrote that the application being considered was, so far as he could ascertain, solely to remove the condition of the percentage of over fifty-five dwellings and he believed that was the only decision to be made. He wrote that no notice had been given of a proposal to increase the number of homes on the site or alter the layout. Mr Foreman concluded that the Planning Committee consider why the application had been submitted and not a "back door" de novo planning application.

Mr Lane spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the application sought to vary the condition that required that fifty percent of the dwellings be occupied by over fifty-fives. Mr Lane said that of the remaining homes to be constructed, the applicant proposed to provide 30 homes for the over fifty-fives. He said that a total of eighty-seven homes for the over fifty-fives would be provided over phases one to six and phases eight to ten. Mr Lane said that phase seven was now a care home and provided 72 specialist units for accommodation and therefore there was a significant proportion of housing for the elderly. He said that committee members would be aware of the concerns raised by the residents which were primarily about highway safety, the impact of more family homes and the impact on the character of the area. Mr Lane said that the number of homes on the site remained the same, as well as the number of bedrooms. He said that there would be no change to the layout and already the over fifty five's households were car users so reducing the restriction would not create additional traffic movements. Mr Lane said that the green spaces on the development would remain as previously approved and there would be no visual impacts as a result of the variation. He said that the only change was regarding who could occupy the properties. Mr Lane said that the properties were not restricted to people who had no vehicles and no children. He said that when people get older, research shows they were less likely to move house. Mr Lane stated that the homes had not been designed for people with mobility issues. He said that the restriction was part of the reason the development had not been completed as the developer was struggling to sell the properties. Mr Lane said that the local plan showed

the need was for specialist accommodation such as care homes, rather than general market housing that were restricted to the over fifty-fives. He stated that there had been no objections raised by any consultees. Mr Lane said that he had worked closely with planning officers, and he hoped committee members would support the application.

Councillor Harness spoke as Ward Councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He said that the overwhelming opinion of residents and Humberston Village Council was that the application should be refused and that the condition should not be removed or varied. Councillor Harness said the development should be built out as intended. He said that the comments from residents that had been submitted clearly detail their reasons for their objections. Councillor Harness said that he had attended a previous meeting regarding a reserved matters application for the site as there were concerns from residents about highway safety and that there would be a lot of traffic going through the over-55's section of the site as it was at the front. He said that the development should be built out as previously approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that these days if somebody was 55 years old, they were unlikely to retire as people were needing to work longer, so it was likely to be people buying these properties that were still in employment. He said that the area was quite an expensive area, and he couldn't see the younger generation being able to afford the homes, so he thought older people would still be the ones purchasing them.

Councillor Lindley said that he could remember the site visit that the Planning Committee had taken, and at that time he thought it was a nice development. He said that the problem with the current application was that the goal posts were being moved, and the residents that had bought their properties had done so in good faith and under the premise that fifty percent of the homes would be for those over the age of fifty-five, and now all of a sudden that needed changing. Councillor Lindley said that if he was resident who had bought a property on that basis, he would be very annoyed. He said that there was a commitment, and he thought that should be stuck to. Councillor Lindley said that by moving the goal posts, it was treating residents with contempt. He said that the development fitted perfectly how it was, and he thought to change the concept of the development was unfair to residents who had bought properties.

Councillor Holland said that he was minded to not support the application. He said that the original planning application was granted on appeal in November 2013 with a condition imposed by the planning inspectorate that the occupation of fifty percent of the dwellings be restricted to people over the age of fifty-five. Councillor Holland stated that it was likely that without that condition, the appeal might not have been granted. He said that he could understand the concerns of residents who had bought properties, thinking they would be in an area almost like a retirement community. Councillor Holland referred to the 'Our Future Homes Housing That Promotes Wellbeing and Community for An Aging Population' government report which stated that "as our

population ages, we need to expand these housing options - not just in variety, but in volume as well. Put simply, we need to offer senior citizens greater choice, particularly as their lifestyle and health needs evolve in later life. Ensuring suitable, accessible and affordable housing for later living is a societal obligation on which the current housing market falls significantly short." He said that he would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Humphrey sought clarification about the impact the application would have on the affordable housing requirement.

Mr Limmer responded that no amendments were proposed to the affordable housing requirement.

Councillor Humphrey said that he was reluctant to allow developers to reduce their commitments. He said that the planning officer's idea of allowing six months for the properties to be sold to those over the age of fifty-five before being able to sell to others was much more sensible than the eight weeks originally proposed. Councillor Humphrey said that he was not sure enough information about the application had been provided to committee members. He said that he would have liked more information about affordable housing on the site, and he thought it could be useful to defer the application.

Mr Limmer said that the Section 106 agreement secured that twenty five percent of the dwellings on the site be affordable housing and that would not change were the application to be approved. He said that the wording of the Section 106 agreement would need to be amended to align with the new planning permission if granted. Mr Limmer reiterated that affordable housing was not under consideration.

Councillor Humphrey said that he was not unsure about the application but was pleased that the affordable housing would be maintained.

Councillor Hudson said that it was quite simple in that if homes restricted for those over the age of fifty-five were required, they would be built out and sold. He said that planning permission was granted ten years ago, and the applicant was clearly struggling to sell the houses restricted to the over fifty-fives. Councillor Hudson said that committee members should consider whether they wanted to see the development stall or whether they allow the developer to continue and hit the homes targets that they were aiming for. He said that there also seemed to be a distinction in the site between the two areas.

Councillor Shutt asked if the number of houses was going to be the same as originally applied for.

Mr Limmer confirmed that was correct, and the physicality of the development would not change should the application be approved. He said that the application was solely about the limitation on who could occupy the homes.

Councillor Shutt said that he understood the concerns of residents when things change down the line. He said that often with developments, market forces changed over time and promises made in 2013 were not always achievable in the present. Councillor Shutt said that he understood both sides of the argument and was unsure about the application as he wanted the developer to succeed but he also understood the concerns raised by residents. He said that he was leaning towards supporting the application as he didn't want the development to stop.

Councillor Parkinson agreed that an eight-week period was too generous and thought that six months was much more appropriate. He said that he could understand why the developer wanted to change the condition and he had never quite seen the point of over-55 developments. Councillor Parkinson said that he was unsure about the application.

Councillor Holland sought clarification that the Planning Committee had the authority to overrule a decision made by the planning inspectorate.

Mr Dixon responded that the Planning Committee would not be overruling the planning inspectorate decision but would be making a planning decision based on the current situation. He said that it was acceptable to vary a decision which was granted on appeal if it was acceptable in planning terms and this was part of the planning process. Mr Dixon said that the site hadn't stood still, and its housing mix had evolved.

Councillor Kaczmarek sought clarification that if the application was approved, it would not be getting rid of the whole condition and the six-month time frame would allow for the remaining thirty homes to be sold to those over the age of 55, and if they were not sold within that time, they could be sold on the open market.

Mr Limmer confirmed that was correct.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was not a retirement village as many over-55s would still be working. He said that he thought six months was an appropriate timeframe for them to be sold to over-55s. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that the condition was set a good number of years ago and times had changed. He said that he thought what was proposed was quite reasonable from the developer. Councillor Pettigrew said that the delivery of homes was an important matter, and he didn't want to see the development stalled. Councillor Pettigrew said that had the dwellings been bought by those over the age of fifty-five, he didn't think the Planning Committee would be dealing with the issue. He said that he was sympathetic to residents, but things had changed. Councillor

Pettigrew said that he thought six months was a reasonable time to restrict who purchased the dwellings and if they were not sold within that time, it could then be opened up to allow others to purchase them. He said that he would support the proposal.

Councillor Lindley said that he stood by his original comments. He said that it was a matter of choice, and the people that had purchased homes on the development had made their choice to live on a development where some of the homes were restricted to those over the age of fifty-five. Councillor Lindley said that residents didn't want sympathy, they wanted equity, and reassurance that the terms in which they had bought their house would remain as agreed. He said that committee members had mentioned that not approving the application that could hold up the development, but there were developments across the borough which had been approved and were not yet built out. Councillor Lindley said that he thought there was enough people over the age of fifty-five that would take up this offer and it seemed that the developers just wanted to sell them as quickly as they could. He stated that residents who had bought their properties on this development had made a choice, and he didn't think that the Planning Committee should pull the rug out from under their feet. Councillor Lindley said that he would not be supporting the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkison said that he understood Councillor Holland's point about overriding a previous decision made by the planning inspectorate. He said that had this application been submitted after a year of the original planning permission being granted, he might have thought differently about it, but it had been twelve years since the original planning permission was granted. Councillor Parkinson said that he thought with a six-month restriction on selling only to those over the age of fifty-five, some would be sold to that age bracket, they wouldn't all be sold to those outside of that age bracket. He stated that he would support the proposal of approval.

Councillor Holland said that he wanted to echo Councillor Lindley's point about choice. He said that some elderly people did want to live on this type of development and if this application was approved, it would be removing that choice. Councillor Lindley said that the government guidance was clear, in that choice had to be provided. He said that residents were happy with the choice they made.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions and delegated back to the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure in order for a Section 106 agreement, a Unilateral Undertaking agreement to be signed and for conditions to be amended.

(Note - the committee voted 8 for and 3 against for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Councillor Humphrey left the meeting.

Item 3 – DM/0599/25/FUL – Grimsby Golf Club, Little Coates Road Grimsby.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that the application 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 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 to vary the location of plot five by three metres. Mr Snowden said that regarding the objections, the proposed new location would not increase the potential of ball strikes, and the mitigation remained as outlined in the approved plans. He said that regarding the location of the dwelling nearer the bunker, appropriate foundations had been designed by their engineer. Mr Snowden said that foundations were due to commence in October. He said that the proposal would not result in a loss of trees or green space. Mr Snowden said that the amount of construction work would remain the same and therefore no additional noise would occur because of the variation. He said that objectors had mentioned future development, however, that would be judged at that time and through the relevant applications, not this one.

Councillor Lindley said that he didn't think the proposed change of moving the dwelling by three metres would have an impact. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that the proposed change was minor. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek sought clarification that there would be no alterations to TPOs on the site.

Mr Limmer confirmed that was correct.

Councillor Holland said that he was concerned that no reason had been given as to why the house was proposed to be moved. He said that if the house remained as originally planned, there would be a symmetry in the site. Councillor Holland said that he understood the points raised by objectors and without any reasoning being provided as to why the house was proposed to be moved, he felt he couldn't support the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note – the committee voted 9 for and 1 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 4 – DM/0357/25/ADV – Grimsby Islamic Cultural Centre, 79A Weelsby Road Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that the application 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.

Councillor Hudson said that he had no issues with the signs but was concerned about the lighting and that would be considered under a different application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that he was a bit nervous that the application for the signs and the application for the lighting were being considered in isolation and he thought it would be more helpful to consider them together. He said that he would be more comfortable knowing what the sign would look like with the proposed lightning. Councillor Lindley referred to the planning officer's photograph and he said the lighting looked too bright and whilst the sign was not an illuminated sign, it looked like one due to the lighting on it. He said that in terms of the size of the sign, it was quite a large sign for the size of the building and when compared to other signs at places of worship nearby, it dwarfed those, but the lighting issue was the concern. Councillor Lindley said that a sign of that size depended on what lightning there would be outside as it could end up being indirectly illuminated. He was nervous about approving the current application without looking at the lighting arrangements. Councillor Lindley said that it might be an idea to defer the application and look at the two applications together or decide upon this and then wait to see what was proposed regarding lighting.

Mr Dixon responded that the sign did have illumination from a trough light which was still there, but the applicant had now applied for a non-illuminated sign. He said that the security lighting shown in the photos was not there for the purpose of illuminating signs. Mr Dixon said that he couldn't see a reason why the current application couldn't be determined, as they were different issues. He said that if there were concerns about the security lightning, that would be addressed in the application regarding lighting.

Councillor Lindley said that the current application was for a non-illuminated sign, and if approved, it would be expected that the sign not be illuminated but we could end up with it being illuminated due to the security lighting. He said that when he looked at the comments from residents, the issue was the illumination. Councillor Lindley said that he would be happy to approve the application if it were not for the issues around illumination. He said that he was worried about what we could end up with, with the subsequent application.

Mr Dixon said that you always have that with light spreading onto signs from light sources such as streetlights. He said that the specific illumination for the sign was the trough light. Mr Dixon said that if there

were concerns about lighting on the site, that would be considered when determining the lighting application.

Ms Lovejoy said that lighting applications were planning applications and were under separate regimes, so there was a level of complexity with it as they were separate considerations.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he agreed with what Councillor Hudson had said. He said that committee members were not there to discuss lighting, and there would be an opportunity to discuss lighting in the future. He said that the sign was slightly larger than other signs, but as the building was not a traditional looking religious building, people might not know it was a Mosque. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Dixon said that were the trough light to be turned on, then the sign would be an illuminated sign, and it wouldn't have consent.

Councillor Hudson asked whether a condition could be added that the trough light be removed.

Mr Dixon responded that we wouldn't do that, and it would be dealt with through the enforcement process.

Councillor Shutt said that it was subjective, and if you lived close by you might think it was a large sign, but if you lived further away, you might not think so. He said that the lighting was a serious issue which would be looked at another time. Councillor Shutt said that he was also going to raise the issue of the trough light. He said that he felt the sign was of a good size for the building.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he thought sign B was slightly on the large size. He said that he agreed with the points raised by Councillor Lindley in that the process felt disjointed. Councillor Pettigrew said that it would look odd for the sign to not be illuminated if it was partially illuminated by the lighting. He said that to not illuminate the sign, but to illuminate the wall next to it, seemed bizarre to him. Councillor Pettigrew said that he thought an application should be brought back before the Planning Committee for signage and lighting.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that his initial concern was the illuminated sign, and whilst he appreciated that was no longer part of the application, the proposed sign had the ability to be illuminated. He understood that if the trough light was turned on, then enforcement action could be taken. Councillor Kaczmarek said that essentially committee members were being asked to approve a non-illuminated sign that had the ability to be illuminated. He said that were the lighting aspect to be removed, he would support the application.

The Chair said that the application was for non-illuminated signs.

Mr Dixon reiterated that were the trough light to be turned on, then enforcement action could be taken if it was in the public interest to do so, having regard to the planning tests.

Councillor Parkinson said that when he was reading the officer's report, a fifteen feet sign did seem large, and he didn't know why the sign needed to be so big. He said that enforcement action could take time, and he thought if it could not be added as a condition that the trough light be removed, could the applicant not just be asked if they would remove it. Councillor Parkinson said that when he looked at the signs in the officer's photos, they didn't appear to be overly big. Overall, he was in favour of the application.

Mr Dixon said that if committee members felt that condition three needed to be amended then the approved plans condition could be defined as stating for non-illuminated signs.

Councillor Parkinson said that he would rather see the trough light removed.

Councillor Holland asked if both applications for the signage and lighting were retrospective.

Mr Dixon responded that they were.

Councillor Holland said that he thought the sign was like a semi illuminated sign. He said that he agreed with Councillor Lindley and Councillor Pettigrew.

Councillor Lindley appreciated that the lighting would be considered under a separate application, but the outcome of that application would have an impact on the signage. He said that committee members were in a difficult position. Councillor Lindley said that when looking at the officer's photos, the lights from the windows would shine as much light on the pathway, car park and main road as the security lights, if not more. He said that the sign was an illuminated sign and that was not what committee members were supposed to be considering. Councillor Lindley said that committee members needed to see what lighting would be in place, get the illumination of the sign removed and then there would be a clearer picture of what it would look like with the signage and lighting together. He said that were the proposal to approve the application to fall, he would propose that the application be deferred in order for the application to be considered alongside the lighting application.

The committee took a vote and upon a vote, 5 voted for 5 voted against for the application to be approved with conditions.

The Chair used his casting vote to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Humphrey returned to the meeting.

P.34 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 22nd August 2025 – 18th September 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.35 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.36 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.37 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 12.00pm.

Minute of the Planning Committee 1st October 2025

Item: 1

Application Number: DM/0435/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: 240 Station Road New Waltham North East Lincolnshire
DN36 4PE

Proposal: Change of use from existing dwelling (Class C3) to a residential home (Class C2) for 2 young people aged between 7 and 17 years

Applicant's Name and Address: Keys Group Limited C/O Agent - Emery Planning 1-4 South Park Court Hobson Street Macclesfield Cheshire SK11 8BS	Agent's Name and Address: Ms Sarah Sands Emery Planning 1-4 South Park Business Court Hobson Street Macclesfield SK11 8BS
---	--

Deposited: 23rd May 2025

Accepted: 23rd May 2025

Expiry Date: 18th July 2025

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 3rd October 2025

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Condition
The development shall be carried out and operated in accordance with the following plans and documents:

Site Location Plan received 23rd May 2025
Block Plan received 23rd May 2025
Existing and Proposed Floor Plans received 23rd May 2025
Planning Statement - dated June 2025

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt in the interests of proper planning and in accordance with Policies 5, 22, 38 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 3 Condition
The site shall be used as a children's home only under Class C2 and shall not be used for any other purpose or use including any others within Class C2.

Reason

To define the permission and to protect amenity and in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 4 Condition
The development shall be operated and managed in accordance with the Planning Statement (Received 13th June 2025) to include the number of children.

Reason

To clarify the permission and in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 5 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that

the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.2 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:
i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published

under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006);
and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm the area character or neighbouring amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular Policies 5, 22, 38 and 41.
- 2 Added Value Statement
Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by securing additional details to alleviate a concern.
- 3 Informative
Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).

Minute of the Planning Committee 1st October 2025

Item: 2

Application Number: DM/0175/25/OUT

Application Type: Outline Application

Application Site: Land South Side Of Humberston Avenue Humberston North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Removal/Variation of Condition 15 (Retirement Homes) attached to DC/107/12/HUM

Applicant's Name and Address: Countryside Partnerships Ltd C/o Agent	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Jack Waugh DPP One Park Row Leeds LS1 5HN
---	--

Deposited: 10th March 2025

Accepted: 1st August 2025

Expiry Date: 31st October 2025

Agreed Extension of Time Date:

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Decision: Approved Conditions and signing of S106

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, in so far as those plans relate to matters not reserved for future determination:

4035-42-AWSM-xx-xx-DR-A-100 P2 Existing over 55s dwellings
4035-42-AWSM-xx-xx-DR-A-103 S2 P7 Proposed over 55 dwellings

Approved under DC/107/12/HUM:

- Site Location Plan B.10,113b
- Illustrative Masterplan 4587-P-10 Revision J
- Development Framework 4587-P-14 Revision B

- Open Space Plan 4587-P-16 Revision B
- Highways Plan 20177_03_005 Revision C

Reason

In the interest of proper planning.

2 Condition

The development shall be built out in accordance with the surface water drainage scheme approved under application reference DM/1022/17/CND, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of flood risk and sustainable drainage in accordance with Policy 33 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

3 Condition

The development shall be built out in accordance with the foul water drainage scheme approved under application reference DM/1022/17/CND, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of pollution control, flood risk and sustainable drainage in accordance with Policy 33 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

4 Condition

The development shall be built in full accordance with the Construction Method Statement submitted on 23rd September 2025, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interest of residential and highway amenities in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

5 Condition

The development shall be built out in accordance with the scheme of archaeological investigation approved under application reference DM/0540/15/CND, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of understanding and protecting the historic environment in accordance with Policy 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

6 Condition

The development shall be built out in accordance with the Ecological Protection and Mitigation scheme approved under application reference DM/0540/15/CND, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of ecological protection and enhancement in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

7 Condition

The development shall be built out in accordance with the Lighting Management Scheme approved under application reference DM/1036/15/CND, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of Ecological Protection in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

8 Condition

Development shall only be carried out in accordance with the Working Methods Statement at page 9 of the submitted Great Crested Newt Report approved under planning application ref: DC/107/12/HUM.

Reason

In the interests of Ecological protection in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

9 Condition

The development shall be built out in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement approved under application reference DM/0540/15/CND, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of tree protection in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

10 Condition

No trees or hedges on the appeal site shall be wilfully damaged, cut down, uprooted, pruned, felled or destroyed except for the trees and hedges to be removed to facilitate the development as shown in the approved Illustrative Masterplan (drg. no. 4587-P-10 Rev J) without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason

In the interests of tree protection in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

11 Condition

None of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied until the access road has been constructed to at least base course level, and lit, in accordance with details first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason

In the interests of highway safety and amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 12 **Condition**
Prior to the occupation of any dwelling on phases 8, 9 or 10 of the development, a detailed plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority that secures an additional 30 dwellings, to those 57 dwellings already provided in earlier phases as detailed on plan ref: 4035-42-AWSM-XX-XX-DR-A-100 P2, in Phases 8, 9 and 10, all of which are to be restricted to occupation only by (i) persons aged 55 years and over; (ii) persons who are living as part of a single household with a person aged 55 years or over; and (iii) persons who were previously living in that dwelling as part of a single household with a person aged 55 years or over who has since died.
The plan shall detail how these dwellings will be subject to a marketing period of at least 6 months at true market value and in a full and proper way. If a dwelling remains unsold after this period details of the marketing exercise shall be submitted to the local planning authority. If the submitted marketing exercise is approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the dwelling may then be offered for sale to the open market.
- Reason**
To create sustainable mixed communities in accordance with Policies 15 and 16 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).
- 13 **Condition**
If, during development, contamination is discovered that has not previously been identified, the local planning authority shall be notified immediately and no further work carried out until a method statement, detailing a scheme for dealing with the contamination discovered, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter proceed only in accordance with the approved details. If, during development, no contamination is found, a written statement confirming that fact must be submitted to the local planning authority upon completion of the construction works.
- Reason**
In the interest of health and safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018)
- 14 **Condition**
The development shall be built out in accordance with the Residential Travel Plan approved under application reference DM/0129/17/CND, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- Reason**
In the interests of sustainable travel in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

Informatives

- 1 **Informative**
The applicant should be aware that conditions from this outline permission are still relevant and must be adhered to.

2 Reason for Approval

The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm the area character or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 15, 16, 18, 22, 33, 39, 41 and 43.

3 Added Value Statement

Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach

In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by working with the applicant on the detail of the conditions imposed.

4 Informative

This application will require the creation of new postal addresses. You are advised to contact the Street Naming & Numbering Team on 01472 323579 or via email at snn@nelincs.gov.uk to discuss the creation of new addresses.

5 Informative

Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).

Minute of the Planning Committee 1st October 2025

Item: 3

Application Number: DM/0599/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Grimsby Golf Club Little Coates Road Grimsby North East
Lincolnshire

Proposal: Variation of Condition 1 (Plans) following DM/0315/24/FUL
to alter site plan (move plot 5 3m back in the plot)

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr Paul Bannister Land Developers (Lincs) Ltd D B C House Grimsby Road Laceby Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN37 7DP	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Daniel Snowden Rose Davy Associates Pelham House 1 Grosvenor Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0QH
---	---

Deposited: 11th July 2025

Accepted: 11th July 2025

Expiry Date: 5th September 2025

Agreed Extension of Time Date:

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

RD4072-10L Proposed site plan

Approved under DM/0315/24/FUL
RD4072-14B Plot 3 plans and elevations
RD4072-15C Plot 4 plans and elevations

RD4072-18K External works plan

Approved under DM/0334/22/FUL:

RD4072-01A Site location plan

RD4072-12A Plot 1 plans and elevations

RD4072-13A Plot 2 plans and elevations

RD:4072-16A Plot 5 plans and elevations

RD4072-18E External works plan

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2 Condition

The development shall be built out in accordance with the surface and foul water plans approved under DM/0316/24/CND, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To prevent an increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

3 Condition

The development shall be built out and occupied in accordance with the bin collection point plans approved under DM/0316/24/CND, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To maintain and protect the visual appearance of the area in accordance with Policy 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

4 Condition

The development shall be built out in accordance with the Construction Management submitted 14th April 2022 and Plan ref:RD4072-18 rev K under DM/0334/22/FUL or in accordance with a replacement plan formally submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To protect the amenities of the area in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

5 Condition

The existing hedgerow shall be removed to allow for the relevant visibility splays of 2,4m x 43m in both directions from the proposed site access point as shown on plan ref: RD4072-10K prior to the occupation of any dwelling on the site. The visibility splays shall then be maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason

In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 6 Condition
The development shall be built out and then occupied in accordance with the highway and access construction plans approved under DM/0316/24/CND, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interest of highway amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 7 Condition
The development shall be built out in accordance with the landscaping plans and thereafter maintained in accordance with plan ref: RD4072-46, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Impact Assessment (under DM/0316/24/CND) shall be fully implemented in accordance with their terms and the approved tree protection measures shall be fully installed prior to any construction works commencing on the site and shall be retained in place throughout construction works. The landscaping shall then be fully completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter managed in accordance with the approved management plan (under DM/0316/24/CND).

Reason

In the interest of visual amenity in accordance with Policies 5, 22 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 8 Condition
The development shall be built out in full accordance with the recommendations set out in the Ecology Appraisal submitted on 14th April 2022 under DM/0334/22/FUL unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be implemented prior to the occupation of any house to which it relates in relation to bat bricks and prior to the occupation of any dwelling in relation to all other measures.

Reason

In the interest of ecology protection and enhancement in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 9 Condition
The development shall be built out in accordance with the boundary treatment plans approved under DM/0316/24/CND, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

The approved boundary treatments shall then be fully installed prior to the occupation of any dwelling on the site and the hedging fully planted out in accordance with the details required and approved under condition 7 of this permission prior to the occupation of any dwelling.

Reason

In the interest of amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 10 Condition
The development shall be built out in accordance with the water use and recycling plans approved under DM/0316/24/CND and the details shall be adhered to at all times following first occupation of each dwelling, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- Reason
To ensure the efficient use of water and to accord with Policy 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).
- 11 Condition
The development shall be built out in accordance with the scheme of Archaeological Investigation approved under DM/0316/24/CND, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- Occupation of the development shall not take place until the applicant has:-
- (a) published, or secured the publishing of the findings resulting from the programme of archaeological work within a suitable media.
(b) deposited, or secured the deposition of the resulting archive from the programme of archaeological work with an appropriate organisation.
- Reason
To ensure the archaeological recording of the site to accord to Policy 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018)
- 12 Condition
Prior to the occupation of any dwelling the 5th tee box, its ball netting (in accordance with plan ref: RD4072-21) and hedging and 8th green on the golf course shall be relocated and fully installed to the positions shown on the plan referenced RD4072-10H and RD4072-20G (all as approved under DM/0334/22/FUL) and they shall then be retained and maintained in the approved locations and not relocated at any time. The hedge shall be maintained at a minimum height of 4m and 1.5m depth.
- Reason
In the interests of safety and amenity to future occupiers in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm the area character or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22, 33, 39, 41 and 43.

- 2 Added Value Statement
Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by seeking to reduce conditions.
- 3 Informative
This application will require the creation of new postal addresses. You are advised to contact the Street Naming & Numbering Team on 01472 323579 or via email at snn@nelincs.gov.uk to discuss the creation of new addresses.
- 4 Informative
Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).

Minute of the Planning Committee 1st October 2025

Item: 4

Application Number: DM/0357/25/ADV

Application Type: Advertisement Consent

Application Site: Grimsby Islamic Cultural Centre 79A Weelsby Road
Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Display 3 non illuminated tray signs (amended description)

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr Helal Aahmed Grimsby Islamic Cultural Centre 79A Weelsby Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0PY	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Alan Scoffin Ross Davy Associates Pelham House 1 Grosvenor Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0QH
--	---

Deposited: 2nd May 2025

Accepted: 12th May 2025

Expiry Date: 7th July 2025

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 6th October 2025

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
This express consent shall expire 5 years from the date of the consent.

Reason
To comply with Regulation 14 of the Town & Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

- 2 Condition
- (i) No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.
 - (ii) No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to-
 - (a) endanger persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome (civil or military);
 - (b) obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air; or
 - (c) hinder the operation of any device used for the purpose of security or surveillance or for measuring the speed of any vehicle.
 - (iii) Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site.
 - (iv) Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public.
 - (v) Where an advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, the site shall be left in a condition that does not endanger the public or impair visual amenity.

Reason

To comply with Regulation 14 of the Town & Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

- 3 Condition
- The approval is for non-illuminated signs in accordance with the following plans :

RD:5897/01C Plans and Elevations
RD:5897/02 B Block and Site Plan
RD:5897/03 Site Location Plan

Reason

To ensure the development is in accordance with the approved details and results in a satisfactory form of development.

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
- The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The adverts do not cause harm to the area character nor prejudice public safety and are acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22 and 39.

2 Added Value Statement

Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach

In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by securing amendments to respond to neighbour concerns.

3 Informative

The consent granted is for non-illuminated signs only. The owner is advised that the trough light above Sign B facing Weelsby Road does not have consent and should be removed. The owner is requested to remove the trough light, fixtures and fittings above Sign B as soon as possible. If the light, fixtures and fittings are not removed within a reasonable period, 3 months, they could be the subject of formal enforcement action to remove them.