



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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

26th March 2025 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright, Emmerson, Goodwin, Hudson, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Mickleburgh (substitute for Patrick), Parkinson, Pettigrew and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

- Lauren Birkwood (Senior Town Planner)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle Fitzgerald (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Lorna McShane (Locum Solicitor)

Others in attendance:

There were 5 members of the public and no member of the press present.

P.74 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.75 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest in any items on the agenda for this meeting.

P.76 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

The Chair reminded committee members that they needed to make sure they outlined clearly their reasons when determining an application in particular for cases when members are proposing to vote differently to the officer's recommendation.

Item 1 - DM/0430/24/FULA - 73 Welholme Avenue Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Dixon 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 wording of condition five had been amended to refer to the wall and gate being reclad and painted instead of a fence. Mr Dixon said that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Shutt said that whilst he noted the neighbours concerns in relation to the retrospective nature of the works, that seemed to be for just the wall. He stated that the new outbuilding would be similar to the old one. Councillor Shutt queried the height difference between the new outbuilding and the old outbuilding.

Mr Dixon responded that the new outbuilding would be slightly higher.

Councillor Shutt said that the inclusion of condition seven would mean that the outbuilding couldn't be used for sleeping. He stated that all of the issues raised by neighbours appear to have been addressed and whilst he understood their frustration with the retrospective nature of the works, he saw no reason to object to the application. Councillor Shutt proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright agreed with Councillor Shutt. He said that the council's heritage officer had initially not been happy with the application, but the applicant had worked with the council's heritage officer to overcome those concerns. Councillor Bright said that it was only the fence that was retrospective works. He was concerned that the cladding of that fence hadn't been secured by a condition.

Mr Dixon referred Councillor Bright to condition five that secured the cladding.

Councillor Bright seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that all of the concerns had been addressed, and he was happy to support the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Lindley said that what was being proposed in the application was a like for like replacement.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 2 - DM/1039/24/FUL - 5 Peaks Avenue, New Waltham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from the Ward Councillors, Councillor Harness and Councillor Shreeve. Mr Dixon outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application, as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon said that the proposed development was considered unacceptable in that it had a poor design and a layout which would negatively impact on the visual character of the area. Mr Dixon concluded that the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Tutill, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. He said that the application was supported by planning policies. Mr Tutill said that Peaks Avenue was home to a broad mixture of homes with varied setbacks and plot widths. Mr Tutill referred committee members to the additional information included in the Supplementary Agenda. Mr Tutill said that the proposed development would not be overbearing or cause overshadowing. He stated that the proposed development respected the scale and context of the area and the design with the partial hipped roof and use of traditional materials responded to the surroundings. Mr Tutill referred to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which outlined that infills of this nature were encouraged. He stated that there were no objections to the application and that the window would have obscured glazing. Mr Tutill said that the applicant intended to build the home for his daughter. He said that the off-street parking would be maintained. Mr Tutill felt that it should be noted that the Ward Councillors had visited the site and had called in the application as it had drawn neighbour support. He asked the Planning Committee to approve the application.

Mr Moore, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Mr Moore said that the neighbours didn't think the proposed development was not in keeping with the area. He said that the property would be for his daughter who wanted to get on the housing ladder.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was not surprised by the Ward Councillors calling in the application. He said that the statement that the proposed development was of poor design was a matter of opinion. Councillor Mickleburgh said that there were no objections from any other consultees. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that he disagreed with officers that the proposed development was of poor design. He said that along Peaks Avenue there was a variety of designs, and it was not uniform. Councillor Lindley said that there were newer properties and older properties on Peaks Avenue, and it was a complete mixture. He disagreed that the proposed development would be harmful to the visual character of the area. Councillor Lindley said that it was not unusual to see new builds. He said that the proposed development was for a small property and the Planning Committee were there to determine whether it would fit in and

were not the style police. Councillor Lindley saw no reason to not approve the application, and he thought it would fit in with the area and be to someone's liking. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he was in agreement with Councillor Mickleburgh and Councillor Lindley.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she did not think the proposed development was particularly a good design, but after having listened to the agent and the applicant, and that there were no neighbours complaining and they were happy with the design, she had changed her mind.

Councillor Bright stated that he agreed with Councillor Goodwin and had thought that the proposed development would be crammed in, but after listening to the speakers he was happy to support the proposal of approving the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he had sympathy with the officer's views as it did seem like a small space, but after listening to the speakers, that was all they seemed to need. He said that there appeared to be neutral comments received from neighbours, not objections and the applicant also said they had signatures from neighbours who did not think the proposed development was not in keeping with the area. Councillor Shutt said that not many people seem to have objected, but he had sympathy with both officers and the applicant.

Councillor Parkinson said that he could see both sides to the argument, but he thought the proposed development did appear to be a bit tight on the plot. Councillor Parkinson said that the variety of houses made the street seem interesting and he thought that whether the proposed development would be detrimental to the street scene was down to the eye of the beholder. He stated that the proposed development fitted in reasonably well but was a bit tight, but he wasn't sure if it was too tight. Councillor Parkinson said that he was leaning towards supporting the proposal of approving the application.

Mr Dixon referred committee members to the neighbour's comments as outlined in the agenda papers. He said that regarding neutral comments, sometimes people didn't always select object on the planning portal as they didn't want to outright object to the application, so they select neutral but outline their concerns in their comments.

Councillor Parkinson said that he didn't think the signatures mentioned by the applicant carried any weight to determining the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he thought committee members were fixated on whether it would be a tight fit, but in terms of planning considerations, he saw no reason to refuse the application. He stated that he had seen similar infill developments approved that were tight on Humberston

Avenue and also in Scartho. Councillor Lindley stated that whilst the proposed development was small, it was satisfactory, and someone would like a smaller house.

Mr Dixon stated that the design of the proposed development was a planning issue, and the view of officers was that it would not look right, but that was the debate to be had.

Councillor Goodwin commented that she was surprised there was no comment submitted by the parish council.

Mr Dixon sought clarification that the reasons for the proposal of approval were that the design was acceptable, the dwelling was sufficient, there were no amenity issues and no technical objections.

Councillor Mickleburgh and Councillor Lindley agreed that those were the reasons.

Mr Dixon outlined the recommended conditions.

Councillor Mickleburgh and Councillor Lindley agreed to the proposed conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Parkinson left the committee at this point and sat in the public seating area.

Item 3 – DM/0860/24/FUL – 122 Middlethorpe Road Cleethorpes

Ms Birkwood introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee as the applicant was an elected member of the Council. Ms Birkwood stated that the application had been deferred at the previous Planning Committee meeting. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Birkwood stated that it was considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact to the street scene and wider character of the area. She concluded that the application was recommended for refusal.

Councillor Parkinson, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He referred to the officer's photos and stated that they showed how crazy the hedges were. Councillor Parkinson said that he had asked the council several times to cut them back but how things were now was a big problem. He said that the hedges needed to be trimmed but in doing so, all the green would go, and what would be left would be a mass of dead wood. Councillor Parkinson said that there had been a lot of

emphasis on the loss of greenery, but he needed no permission to take down the hedges. He would be sad to lose the hedges as they did provide good protection, but the whole thing did bring to mind neglect. Councillor Parkinson said that had the hedges been trimmed, we wouldn't be in the position we were now. He said that there was no requirement to replant anything, but the idea was to put around 50 conifers there which were fast growing and would merge together but be trimmed regularly. Councillor Parkinson said that whilst it would cost him, he wanted to do it. He said that the council's trees officer didn't seem to have an issue with the application initially but then changed his mind. Councillor Parkinson said that he didn't know if the council's tree officer could object if no permission was required. He stated that the council's tree officer looked again and realised how bad it looked and thought replanting with a good type of tree would be a good thing to do. Councillor Parkinson said that the council's trees officer had not objected to the current plan. He said that the idea was to replace the hedges with a 2.4 metre tree which would be well above the fence in the first years. Councillor Parkinson said that due to the length of time the application had taken, there could be loss of some growth this year. He stated that there was a 4ft wall around the perimeter of the nearby school.

Having declared his interest in the item, Councillor Parkinson left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was not good to take trees away, but there seemed to be some doubt as to what the council's tree officer's opinion was about the application. He said that if the applicant was right, he could remove the hedges without permission. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he would like to know if there were other fences in that particular area, as the erection of the fence seemed to be what the applicant needed permission for.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he didn't understand the need for the fence. He said that he understood the idea of a temporary fence. Councillor Kaczmarek said that he was struggling to see why the Planning Committee would disagree with officers. He stated that the hedges were working well, and he didn't think it was a good idea to put a great big fence up. Councillor Kaczmarek proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Hudson said that there were no neighbour objections received about the application. He said that once the hedge reached the stage it currently was, the only idea was to chop it down. Councillor Hudson said that if it was established that the applicant could cut the hedge down anyway, the question was then whether the fence was acceptable. He queried whether the fence might be needed for security. Councillor Hudson said that without driving down Taylor's Avenue and having a look, he was unsure as to whether the fence would look out of place. He said that he was minded to approve the application but would listen to the debate.

Councillor Pettigrew said that when hedges were cut back, they could look horrendous, so putting up a boundary seemed sensible. He said that he was sceptical as to why the fence would be on the outside and not the inside, but the applicant had said they would be putting trees in. Councillor Pettigrew said that if the Planning Committee allowed the fence to be put up, painted green and trees planted, he thought that would be a sensible approach. He stated that he didn't think that would be detrimental and if members were minded to approve the application, he would ask that a condition be added that the fence be painted green.

Councillor Bright said that he did go and have a look at the hedges, and due to their prominent position, there would be a visual impact. He said that he appreciated there would be a new hedge, but there was no mention of the fence being temporary and that even if the hedge grew above the fence, the fence would remain. Councillor Bright said that he thought a site visit might be a good idea. He stated that he thought the fence would be detrimental to the area.

Councillor Lindley said that he was struggling with the application, as there was no doubt the hedges needed to come down due to their height and shape, but he was treading cautiously as he was a bit frightened of what it would look like at first. He said that the proposed fence was a standard six-foot fence, but the planting would take time develop. Councillor Lindley said that in general it would look different for a while, and people driving past would notice, but it would start to blend. He said that he was leaning towards supporting the application but would listen to the debate.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that the applicant seemed to have the right to take the hedges down. He asked whether a condition could be included that the fence be removed.

Mr Dixon responded that, that was not what the applicant had asked for in the application. He said that the Planning Committee needed to consider the application as it was. He said that if the applicant wanted to change the application, then that would be considered at the time.

Councillor Shutt said that he could see why the applicant would want to take the hedges down as they looked like they had fulfilled their use. He said that he was leaning towards supporting the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that she was concerned about what would happen to the street scene. She said that it would look horrendous. Councillor Goodwin sought clarification on how much of the hedges would be taken down.

Ms Birkwood referred committee members to a photo of the hedges and stated that they would be removed up to the lamppost.

Councillor Goodwin stated that it would look out of place. She seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Hudson sought clarification on whether the applicant could cut the hedge down without permission.

Mr Dixon stated that was correct.

Councillor Hudson said that with that in mind, the application was for the fence, and he thought a green fence would blend in.

The Chair stated that he had no issue with the application. He said that the hedges were a mess, and the maintenance must be horrendous.

Councillor Goodwin said that if the hedges were taken down, which they could be, the green fence would stand out due to the continuation of the hedges further down the street.

The Planning Committee took a vote and upon a vote, 5 for voted for and 5 against the refusal of the application. The Chair's casting vote was to vote against the refusal of the application.

Councillor Pettigrew proposed that the application be approved with the additional condition that the fence be painted green.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Dixon sought clarification that the reason for the proposal of approval was that the fence would be acceptable in the street scene.

Councillor Pettigrew and Councillor Shutt agreed that that was the reason.

Mr Dixon outlined the recommended conditions.

Councillor Pettigrew and Councillor Shutt agreed to the conditions.

The Planning Committee took a vote and upon a vote, 5 for voted and 5 voted against the application being approved with conditions. The Chair's casting vote was to vote for the application being approved with conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for and 5 against with the Chair's casting vote being in favour and the application was approved with conditions.)

Councillor Parkinson returned to the meeting.

P.77 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 13th February 2025 – 13th March 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.78 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.79 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.80 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

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

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

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 11.05am.