



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 20th March 2024

PLANNING COMMITTEE

8th January 2024 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Aisthorpe (substitute for Emmerson), Dawkins, (substitute for Hudson), Holland (substitute for Bright), Humphrey (substitute for Goodwin), Lindley, Mickleburgh (substitute for Kaczmarek), Parkinson, Pettigrew and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Jonathan Cadd (Senior Town Planner)
- Lara Hattle Fitzgerald (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Richard Limmer (Senior Town Planner)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Keith Thompson (Lead Solicitor)

Others in attendance:

There were 9 members of the public present and one member of the press.

P.52 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received for this meeting from Councillors Bright, Emmerson, Goodwin, Hudson, Kaczmarek and Patrick.

P.53 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Humphrey declared a pecuniary interest in P.54 Item 4 – DM/0751/24/FULA as his partner was employed by the agent.

P.54 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Item 1 - DM/0402/24/FUL - Land on Former Garage Site, Great Coates Road, Grimsby

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the demolition of a former filling station kiosk and drive through car wash buildings. Mr Cadd stated that the application also sought planning permission for the erection of a drive through coffee shop with indoor seating area and a utility yard as well as a detached health care unit, air conditioning units, substation and installation of electric vehicle charging points. He said that the application also sought planning permission for a new pedestrian access, erection of a 2.5 metre and 3-metre-high noise barrier fences to the side and rear, landscaping, car parking arrangements and associated works. Mr Cadd stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Cadd outlined to the Planning Committee the main issues regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 6, 22, 23, 33, 34, 36, 38 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Bamford spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the applicant fully supported the officer's report and had worked with planning officers positively. Mr Bamford said that the applicant was prepared to fully remediate the contamination. He explained that having a food retail unit was originally part of the application, but that had now been replaced and would be a dentist instead, which would attract fewer trips. Mr Bamford said that both buildings would be single storey and there would also be EV chargers at the site. He said that the roof of the buildings would be about the same level of the eaves of nearby properties and the buildings would not be dominant in the street scene. Mr Bamford said that a Noise Impact Assessment had been undertaken as well as a landscaping scheme. He said that sensitive lighting scheme had also been proposed.

Mr Jordan spoke in support of the application. He stated that he was a Transport Consultant working with the applicant. Mr Jordan said that the proposal had been assessed against the industry standard. He said that he had co-operated with the council and provided technical drawings to show that all vehicles could safely enter and exit the site and that there would be sufficient parking and space on site. Mr Jordan said that all parking would be contained in the side and that the data showed that during the busier hours, there would be one vehicle a minute entering or leaving the site. He stated that a dentist was considered to be a low-level trip generator and that there were no reasons to refuse the application based on highways grounds.

Councillor Dawkins said that the site had been an eyesore for a long time. He said that he did not think that the proposed development would generate more traffic than what the petrol station did that used to be on the site. Councillor Dawkins stated that it was great to see a new dentist being built and the EV chargers were a welcome addition. He said that what was proposed was a nice development and that housing would never be built on the site due to the power cables and he therefore thought it was a great compromise.

Councillor Lindley said that he could remember when the petrol station was open and that it was a 24-hour station. He said that the site was a brownfield site and was ideal for what was being proposed. Councillor Lindley said that he was pleased that a dentist was also included as part of the development. He said that he thought a lot of the residents would have lived in the area when the petrol station was open and what was now proposed would be less invasive than that. Councillor Lindley said that with regard to the access and egress, the arrangements were very similar to when the site was a petrol station. He said that at peak times, the roundabout was busy and there was also noise from the traffic, but he didn't think the proposed development would contribute to that. Councillor Lindley stated that dentists were needed in the area. He said that that he was happy with the application and thought it was an application the Planning Committee should be supporting. Councillor Lindley said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he could remember when the site was used for a petrol station. He said that it was always great to see sites being brought back into use. Councillor Mickleburgh said that the area was not just a residential area, as there were two care homes nearby, the Humber Royal Hotel and the pub. He stated that dentists were needed in the area. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was pleased that EV chargers were included in the application as one of the main issues with electric vehicles was the lack of chargers. He said that he had a slight reservation about the application with regard to extra traffic and the impact on pedestrians. Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was very difficult to cross the road in the area as there was not a proper zebra or pelican crossing. He stated that the area would also be impacted by the former Western School development and a proper crossing was needed. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt said that it was a shame what had happened to the site, and it was nice to see a new development proposed which would bring the site back into use. He said that if passed, the site would go through a scheme with regard to contamination and those concerns would be addressed then. Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Holland said that the application sought permission for the demolition of the building, but that had already happened. He queried condition 12 and 13.

Mr Cadd responded that the demolition had taken place prior to the application being determined, but the works underneath still needed to be dealt with and conditions 12 and 13 were in relation to that work.

Councillor Holland said that his main concern was regarding pedestrians on the pavement. He said that he would like to see a condition added that a walkway be put in with lines so pedestrians could cross safely.

Mr Cadd said that there would be sufficient space for such a situation.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions

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

Item 2 - DM/0803/24/FUL - 21 Signhills Avenue, Cleethorpes

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it sought retrospective planning permission to erect a single storey rear extension with roof lantern and infill an existing site window with associated works. Mr Cadd said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from a Ward Councillor, Councillor Parkinson. Mr Cadd outlined to the Planning Committee the main issues regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Parkinson said that the extension dwarfed the conservatory next door and whilst it was slightly better than what was planned, it was still too high. He said that he thought the extension dominated next door's conservatory and would affect the light. Councillor Parkinson said that there was a gap in between that wouldn't be able to be rendered. He queried whether building regulations had been involved with the application.

Mr Cadd said that the applicant had indicated they would render it. He said that the majority of the extension would not be seen by adjoining occupiers. Mr Cadd said that he could not comment on building regulations. He said that there was an adjoining solid wall, and some water would drain down there, but it was not considered that it would have an adverse impact.

Councillor Parkinson said that it looked like the extension was domineering to the conservatory next door. He said that he was not happy when people continue with work without planning permission.

Mr Cadd said that the planning system did allow for retrospective applications. He said that if a development was not acceptable, then applicants were at risk of an enforcement case being submitted against them. Mr Cadd stated that the extension was quite large but was not considered to be too much and the impacts of the extension were not considered to be unreasonable.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was considering proposing that a site visit take place, but he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Lindley said that he did not like retrospective applications and the situation the Planning Committee was now in, was exactly the reason why. He said that there were clearly issues and he did not think the breeze blocks wall could be rendered on the right hand side as the gap was only six inches wide. Councillor Lindley stated that it would not be able to be done without the adjoining wall being taken down. He said that there was no longevity with breeze blocks, and it was disappointing to see a building like this go up. He said that he had no hesitation in refusing retrospective applications if he felt they were not right. Councillor Lindley said that just because an extension was there, doesn't mean it should just be approved. He said that he thought the height of the extension would be intrusive to the neighbours and he felt for the neighbours. Councillor Lindley said that the Planning Committee was in a difficult position, and he would listen to the debate, but he was not happy with the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he agreed with other members regarding the issues of retrospective applications. He said that he was not sure what should happen and whether the extension should be taken down or whether the application be approved and if the application were approved, would that tell others they could exploit loopholes in the planning system. Councillor Mickleburgh stated that had the application been considered prior to any works commencing, he thought it would have been rejected or approved with amendments.

Councillor Shutt said that he agreed with what other members had said. He said that he would not like to have the extension next door to him. Councillor Shutt said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Humphrey queried how much of the application would be allowed under permitted development. He said that there were other properties nearby with extensions and he wondered how the specific extension compared.

Mr Cadd responded that in terms of permitted development rights, an extension was allowed under permitted development as long as it didn't extend beyond three metres. He stated that the specific extension extended beyond that at 4.6 metres.

Councillor Humphrey said that he was torn and thought a site visit would be useful and it would also be interesting to see what else was in the area.

Councillor Holland referred to page 46 of the representations document. He said that it showed a damp patch on the block work, and he couldn't see how it would be possible to render. Councillor Holland said that had the application come before this committee prior to construction, changes would have been made as the current situation was not acceptable.

Councillor Dawkins queried whether building control had been involved with the development from the beginning.

Mr Cadd said that he did not have that information.

Councillor Dawkins said that if they were involved, surely, they would have raised concerns. He said that he was concerned as the builder should know that planning permission was needed. Councillor Dawkins said that the works had continued and there had been a blatant disregard for the planning system. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Lindley said that the Planning Committee had to make brave decisions and approving the application could open the flood gates for people to build structures and then apply for planning permission which could be approved as the structures were already built. Councillor Lindley said that was not how planning worked and he would support the proposal of refusal.

Mr Cadd said that he understood committee members frustrations regarding retrospective applications, but they were part of the planning system. He said that committee members needed to focus on the merits of the application. Mr Cadd reiterated that building regulations were not a matter for the Planning Department.

Councillor Shutt said that he would support Councillor Parkinson's idea of a site visit as it would allow members to look at the extension and it might change minds or confirm people's thoughts.

Councillor Lindley said that there were serious ramifications if the application was refused, so he thought a site visit would be sensible.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he would support a site visit and would like to examine the development carefully.

Councillor Dawkins said that he was happy to amend his proposal and to instead propose that the application be deferred to allow for a site visit.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal of deferment to allow for a site visit.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred.

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

Item 3 – DM/0751/24/FULA - 26 Swales Road, Humberston

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the demolition of an existing porch and conservatory. He said that the application also sought planning permission for the creation of living accommodation at the first floor and the erection of a two-storey extension to the side as well as a roof lift to include roof lights. Mr Cadd said that the application also included the installation of a dormer window with a Juliet balcony to the rear as well as amendments to window openings. He said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council as well as objections from neighbours. Mr Cadd outlined to the Planning Committee the main issues regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Hyde spoke as the agent for the application. He said that there was an existing bungalow on the site and there was a generous rear garden and driveway. Mr Hyde said that Humberston was a very diverse area in terms of character and mixture of properties. He said that the neighbouring property to the North had not objected to the application, but there had been some objections. Mr Hyde said that with regard to the extension to the North, there would be sufficient space to move vehicle round the property and there would also be space for six car parking spaces. Mr Hyde stated that there were no technical objections to the application. He said that a Juliet balcony was proposed, and the garage was proposed to be retained and would provide screening. Mr Hyde said that he didn't believe there would be any issues of overlooking. He asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he thought the application was well thought out and there lots of positives with the proposed development. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate, but the application looked good to him.

Councillor Lindley said that he thought the application was for a good scheme and there was a varied mix of housing in the area. He said that it seemed to fit in, and number 24 had not objected. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Parkinson said that he thought the application was an improvement on the original and would improve the area.

Mr Cadd clarified that there was an error with the conditions and an additional condition was needed regarding the window and that it be retained obscured.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was nice to see a variation. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions

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

Councillor Humphrey left the meeting at this point.

Item 4 – DM/0751/24/FULA – 37 Westkirke Avenue, Grimsby

Mr Limmer introduced the outline application and explained that it sought planning permission to erect a detached dwelling and garage including the formation of a new vehicle access with access to be considered. Mr Limmer said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Limmer outlined to the Planning Committee the main issues regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 39, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and sections 5, 12, 14 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Mr Limmer stated that the application was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Deakins spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the garden was not always the size it was now, and it had been added to over time. Mr Deakins said that the dwelling would be in scale with other properties in the area. He said that there was plenty of off-street parking and fantastic visibility and he fully agreed with officers regarding the low boundary walls. Mr Deakins said that he didn't see that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on any of the neighbours. He said that he took on board comments from objectors, and they were understandable comments regarding construction traffic, but this was a much smaller development and would be managed. Mr Deakins said that the site was not located in a flood risk area and was in line with planning policy. He asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that it did look from the ariel view that there should be a house there. He said that he thought the proposed development would fit in comfortably and it would not cause an over intensification of the site. Councillor Lindley said that he thought the concerns raised were legitimate, but he thought that they could be ironed out through the process and discussions should continue. He said that the curb did look quite severe but not as sharp as you think. Councillor Lindley said that the proposed development had a good design. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he had concerns over traffic and that people who lived in that street often had two cars. He said that this could lead to accidents.

Councillor Shutt said that he didn't think the house would be out of place and the design was similar to other houses in the area. He said that he didn't understand some of the objections related to house value. Councillor Shutt said that you could see down both roads and agreed with having low boundary walls. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Limmer said that the site had provision for off street parking for three vehicles.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that lots of people tended to sometimes still park on the street.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he would support the application.

Councillor Lindley said that regarding parking, the site had a generous drive, but there were narrow drives in the area, so that was why there was on street parking, but the proposed development wouldn't contribute to that.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 8 for 0 against with 1 abstention for the application to be approved with conditions).

Councillor Humphrey returned to the meeting.

Item 5 – DM/0172/24/FUL – Manor Golf Course, Barton Street, Laceby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the variation of condition four pursuant to DM/1113/21/FUL in order to allow extended occupancy. Mr Limmer explained that the applicant wanted condition four to be removed with condition three being relied upon. He stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Laceby Parish Council. Mr Limmer outlined to the Planning Committee the main issues regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Taylor spoke in support of the application and on behalf of the agent who was unable to attend the meeting. He said that Laceby Manor was seen as successful in the area and was recognised nationally and part of that was due to its lodge development. Mr Taylor said that having the flexibility in regard to occupancy had worked well. He said that the applicant wanted to make it clear that no one lived in the lodges and the application was not an attempt to change that. Mr Taylor said that he believed that was what the parish council were concerned about, but this application was just to allow for more flexibility and ask that the current

three-month restriction regarding occupancy be removed which would bring in line all of the lodges at Laceby Manor, as some had the three month restriction and others didn't. Mr Taylor said that when the conditions were agreed, they hadn't noticed the three-month restriction condition and that was why they had now submitted the current application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he had listened to what the applicant had said and there was no desire from them to make the lodges permanent accommodation. He said that they wanted to the conditions for this set of lodges to be in line with the other lodges. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that he did initially think that the application was a move towards making the lodges permanent accommodation, but his concerns had now been allayed after hearing the applicant explain. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he had thought the same as Councillor Dawkins but could now see that was not the case. He said that he didn't know if this was a move to sell the lodges but that was not a consideration for the Planning Committee. He stated that he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Lindley said that it was great to see the development of Laceby Manor. He said that he thought the parish council was objecting to something that was not actually proposed. He stated that he was happy to support the application and that Laceby Manor contributed to the area.

Councillor Parkinson queried whether if someone occupied one of the lodges for the maximum time of three months, could they then change to another one.

Mr Limmer said that if the application was approved, condition four would be removed as a result. He referred committee members to condition three which stated that a person had to wait for two months to stay in a different lodge at the site if they had stayed there for three months.

Councillor Aisthorpe queried why the three-month occupation condition was attached to the previous application for the lodges if it wasn't for the applications regarding the other lodges.

Mr Limmer said that it was a precautionary approach and was done to see how the site as a whole would develop.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 6 - DM/0757/24/FULA – Greenlands, Old Main Road, Barnoldby Le Beck

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the creation of a second floor in order to create additional living accommodation. He said that the application also sought planning permission for a roof reinstatement and the installation of three rear facing dormers as well as an increase in the height of the chimney with various associated works. Mr Limmer said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council and neighbour objections. Mr Limmer outlined to the Planning Committee the main issues regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Dawkins said that the gable ends matched the property next door, and he saw no issues with the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Pettigrew referred to the supplementary papers and queried the height.

Mr Limmer said that if it was higher, an amendment would need to be sought by the applicant.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 7 - DM/0708/24/FULA – 10 Station Road, Stallingborough

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission to erect an extension to the side in order to create a garage at the ground floor and first floor storage in the roof space, with a dormer to the front with associated works. He said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Stallingborough Parish Council. Mr Cadd outlined to the Planning Committee the main issues regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

The Chair queried what the impact would be on the Signhills extension.

Mr Cadd responded that in terms of the relationship between them, there was a gap, and it was not tight.

Councillor Shutt queried whether people had been consulted.

Mr Cadd said that letters had been delivered.

Councillor Shutt said that the Planning Committee had to go on the information provided to them, and no objections had been received apart from the parish council objection. He said that he would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he thought the design and character of the extension would be detrimental to the village and dominating. He stated that he thought the character of the area would be harmed as a result. Councillor Pettigrew said that the neighbour had submitted a neutral comment, but no objections had been received.

Councillor Dawkins said that the neighbour hadn't objected, if they had, then he might have thought differently about the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that there was no objection from the neighbour. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that the proposed development might look a bit odd, but as the neighbour hadn't objected to the application, he thought it would be fine.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 9 for and 1 against for the application to be approved with conditions)

Item 8 - DM/0841/24/FUL - 83 Peterson Drive, New Waltham

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension, the installation of double door to the side elevation of the existing garage and the replacement of windows and doors to the front and side elevations. Mr Limmer said that the application also sought planning permission for the installation of an additional fence panel along the side boundary and the installation of double gates to the existing driveway. He said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the applicant being a senior member of the Planning Department. Mr Limmer outlined to the Planning Committee the main issues regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was important that the application was considered by the Planning Committee for transparency reasons. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt said that it was a sensible application. He 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.)

P.55 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 14th November – 18th December 2024

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.56 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.57 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.58 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 11.45am.