



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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

23rd April 2025 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)
Councillors Bright, Emmerson, Goodwin, Hudson, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Patrick, Parkinson, and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

- Matthew Chaplin (Public Rights of Way Mapping Officer)
- Owen Toop (Senior Town Planner)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Richard Limmer (Senior Town Planner)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Lara Hattle Fitzgerald (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Hannah Steer (Solicitor)

Others in attendance:

There were 15 members of the public and no member of the press present.

P.81 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.82 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Parkinson declared a pecuniary interest in P.85 Item 3 DM/0605/24/FUL as he owned a business nearby.

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald stated that she was friends with the applicant for P.85 Item 5 DM/0086/25/FUL and would therefore leave the room whilst the application was being considered.

**P.83 EXTINGUISHMENT OF PART OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH 67,
WALTHAM**

The committee considered a report from Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure recommending the making of an Order to extinguish part of Waltham Public Footpath 67 as shown in Appendix 1. Mr Chaplin outlined to committee members the key matters as detailed in the report within the agenda papers.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the recommendations as outlined in the report be approved.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the recommendations.

RESOLVED -

1. That the making of an Order in accordance with Highways Act 1980 Section 118 and Wildlife and Countryside Act 53A (2) be approved.
2. That the deletion Order be confirmed as made and, subject to there being no objections or in the event of objections which cannot be resolved and withdrawn, the Order be referred to the Planning Inspectorate for determination.

(Note – the committee voted unanimously for the recommendations to be approved.)

**P.84 DIVERSION OF PART OF PUBLIC BRIDLEWAY 12,
GRIMSBY**

The committee considered a report from Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure recommending the making of an Order to divert part of Grimsby Public Bridleway 12 as shown in Appendix 1. Mr Chaplin outlined to committee members the key matters as outlined in the report within the agenda papers. Mr Chaplin stated that there had been a minor amendment made to the plan since the publication of the agenda, but that the amended plan had been circulated to committee members and the recommendations as outlined in the report hadn't changed.

Councillor Hudson said that the minor diversion was needed for a genuine reason. He proposed that the recommendations including the amendment be approved.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the recommendations with the amendment.

RESOLVED –

1. That the making of Order in accordance with Highways Act 1980 be approved.
2. That the diversion Order as made be confirmed and, subject to there being no objections, or in the event of objections which cannot be resolved and withdrawn, the Order be referred to the Planning Inspectorate for determination.

(Note – the committee voted unanimously for the recommendations with the amendment to be approved.)

P.85 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Item 1 - DM/0806/24/FUL - Land Adjacent To 9 Ashby Close And 19 Glenfield Road, Ashby Close, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon said that the application was recommended for approval but due to a need to address biodiversity net gain as a tree was being removed, it was recommended that the application be delegated back to officers to enable that to be done.

Ms Gaughan spoke in objection to the application. She said that she had been a resident on Glenfield Road for over forty years and had bought her property which was opposite the play area. Ms Gaughan stated that the area was designated as a play area in the 1970s and she didn't know where the idea had come from that it was not. She said that the area had never been designated as a car park. Ms Gaughan said that her neighbours had asked her to speak on their behalf and that all her neighbour's children and grandchildren used the area. Ms Gaughan said that children coming from Wybers and from school used the walkway. She had contacted Mr Chaplin regarding the walkway as it had been used as a pathway for forty years by both children and adults. Ms Gaughan explained that the walkway was used as it was a safe passageway for children and if they now would have to go around instead, it would not be safe. She said that the area should be maintained and neighbours had kept it tidy over the years. Ms Gaughan said that the Council had not done much to the area, but it was a play area and should be maintained as such and as a safe area for children. She said that she didn't think the Highways Department had really investigated how it would impact people by putting double yellow lines in. Ms Gaughan stated that the community felt ignored. She said that Councillors should be helping the community and making safe areas for children. Ms Gaughan said that she would love for members of the Planning Committee to come and see the area. She said that they would see children sitting outside and playing on their bikes. Ms Gaughan said that there had not been any problems with the area and Councillors should not allow the area to be used for more housing. She stated that the proposed houses were also not in keeping with the character of the area

and as a parent and grandparent, she thought the area should be utilised as a play area.

Mr Berryman spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the land would be sold as freehold by the Council. Mr Berryman stated that the proposed development supported both policy three and policy four of the local plan. He said that the site was located within flood zone one. Mr Berryman said that the application sought permission for four, four-bedroom houses and these types of houses were increasingly in demand. He stated that the proposed development would be a natural infill to the area. Mr Berryman said that the proposed garages would be sited at the adjacent dwellings which was typical to the character of the area. He said that concerns had been raised by residents regarding the proposed materials and he was happy to agree these as part of the conditions. Mr Berryman said that there would be obscured glazing to the first-floor windows. He explained that the proposed development would not cause adverse harm and would be in line with policies two and five of the local plan. Mr Berryman said that the design of the proposed development was of high standard, incorporated solid fencing and enhanced wildlife. He said that objections to the application had been raised regarding loss of a play area and green space. Mr Berryman said that there was no evidence that the site was used as a formal play area, and whilst there were aspirations for such, no planning application had been submitted. He said that he understood neighbours concerns regarding construction, but it would be temporary, and a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be in place. Mr Berryman acknowledged the concerns about parking, but the Highways Department had not objected to the application and had requested yellow lines. He said that regarding the loss of a walking route, the area was not designated as a public right of way and there were other pedestrian's routes available. Mr Berryman said that the proposed development would contribute to the housing requirements for the borough. He asked Planning Committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Holland spoke as Ward Councillor for the Freshney Ward. He said that he had provided photos which showed that the pathway was heavily used, so much so that the Council had put a bin in place and there had also been properties built at the side, with the pathway being maintained. Councillor Holland stated that street lighting had also been installed. He said that the pathway had been established as such for forty years and was a public right of way and whilst it was not on the defined map, the process had started for it to be. Councillor Holland said that he saw no reason as to why the pathway should disappear and that the council had also provided planting in the area of the pathway. He stated that residents saw the pathway as an amenity and school children used it daily. Councillor Holland said that if the application were approved, the pathway would be lost and blocked off. He asked Planning Committee members to retain the pathway and not decide upon the application until the pathway had been established. Councillor Holland stated that residents object to the application. He said that the land belonged to the council, and he had concerns about the council agreeing to block access

to the pathway for commercial reasons. Councillor Holland said that there were four hundred properties for sale in the area, but only sixty-two one-bedroom properties, and that was instead where the shortage was and not with four-bedroom houses. He said that the shortage had also led to an increase in houses of multiple occupancy. Councillor Holland said that the houses were not in keeping with the area, and whilst brownfield development was preferred, the proposed development would result in the removal of amenity for residents. He said that the pathway was a well-established right of way which had been used by generations.

Councillor Hudson said that when he initially looked at the application, it seemed to be a simple infill development but then he had looked at the specific issues and also heard from speakers that the footpath had been used for forty years. He said that recently a footpath in Laceby which had previously not been established, had become established as residents had got together and applied for it to be as they used it as one. Councillor Hudson said that he thought it was the case that if a footpath was used it could therefore be established and recognised as one on the map.

Mr Chaplin said that in order for a footpath to be established, twenty years of continued use needed to be proven. He said that the specific path was not currently on the map.

Councillor Hudson said that whilst it was not on the map at present, it was clearly being used and apparently for a period of forty years. He said that if the footpath were to be lost, it would be detrimental, and he didn't see how the application could proceed without the issue of the footpath being addressed. Councillor Hudson said that he could see how the site could accommodate the houses and thought the access seemed fine, but the footpath was an issue. He stated that the site was used, and he thought the area would be poorer for losing it.

Councillor Lindley said that forty years was a long time and whilst the footpath was not a designated right of way, it had been maintained as such. Councillor Lindley stated that the photos that had been provided by the ward councillor showed that there was even street lighting. He queried why the footpath was maintained and illuminated if it was not to be used as such. Councillor Lindley said that just because the site didn't have a play area, that didn't mean it wasn't utilised, and the site had obviously been used for a decade with children playing football. He stated that for the site to be filled in, it would have a massive impact on residents and those that had lived there for forty years and those residents were also probably not told that the site would be filled in for housing. Councillor Lindley said that infill developments could work but this one didn't feel appropriate. He said that the site was a shared space which was utilised, and the footpath had been maintained. Councillor Lindley said that he was leaning towards refusing the application but would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Shutt said that the land was owned by the Council and was sold to the developer for development. He said that were the application to be

refused, it could be allowed upon appeal. Councillor Shutt said that the situation was frustrating, but he agreed with Councillor Holland that the issue of the footpath needed resolving.

Councillor Bright said that the public right of way issue needed to be resolved. He said that he didn't think the application would necessarily be allowed on appeal. Councillor Bright asked whether the land had now been sold or was still under Council ownership.

Mr Limmer responded that the land had not been sold, and that the sale was dependent on planning permission.

Councillor Bright said that he thought the public rights of way issue needed to be determined. He said that if the application needed to be decided today, it should be refused.

Councillor Goodwin said that if the right of way was being maintained then it was obviously being used and that issue needed to be sorted. She said that the houses that were proposed to be built would stick out like a sore thumb and were not sympathetic to the area. Councillor Goodwin said that she was leaning towards voting to refuse the application. She stated that the site had forty years of memories for residents, and she didn't see why that should be changed in order to allow for additional houses which would look out of place.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that there was a lot of uncertainty regarding the footpath, and he didn't think he could make an informed decision about the application until that issue was resolved. Councillor Kaczmarek proposed that the application be deferred in order to allow for the public rights of way issue to be resolved.

Councillor Parkinson said that he didn't think the buildings would be a particular detriment, although the space would be lost, but the footpath was a different issue. He said that it was obvious that it was intended to be a footpath and that's why it had been maintained. Councillor Parkinson stated that he didn't think that land should be part of the application, and the land should be taken from the building plot instead. He said that modern buildings were not a bad thing, and the ones proposed looked interesting. Councillor Parkinson seconded the proposal to defer the application in order for the issue of the footpath to be dealt with.

Mr Dixon said that the Planning Committee could defer the application, but it was felt by planning officers that the design was fine. He said that no history of the site being a play area had been found, and it was not allocated in the local plan as such. Mr Dixon stated that the footpath was not a definitive right of way, but he could hear from committee members that was an issue of concern, so deferring the application could be the right way forward.

Councillor Patrick said that the objector and Councillor Holland had put forward a very good case. He said that initially looking at the application,

it appeared to be a simple infill development on a brownfield site, but he shared the concern of the residents regarding the footpath. Councillor Patrick said that he thought the application should be deferred to allow for the footpath to become a designated right of way. He said that he believed that the site was initially put in to attract residents and now a few decades later, it was proposed to be filled. Councillor Patrick said that whilst the site might be considered a disused space in the planning world, it was used by children, and they were part of the community. He stated that he would support the proposal of deferring the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he was not as keen on supporting the proposal to defer the application. He said that the site was considered a disused space because the council had allowed it to be. Councillor Lindley said that initially there would have been good intentions for the space, but it simply hadn't happened. He said that the space had fallen into a bit of disrepair, but the council still owned the land, and it would be amiss not to consider what it could be. Councillor Lindley stated that to simply sell the land would be wrong. He said that he was not particularly happy with the application being deferred but if that's what the rest of the Planning Committee wanted to do, then that would happen, and the application would be considered again in the future. Councillor Lindley said that the Planning Committee had sometimes made unanimous decisions which were then overturned, but committee members shouldn't be frightened of making decisions. He said that he would support the proposal to defer the application but would have also supported refusing the application.

Councillor Bright said that there had been comments made that the site was disused but after listening to the speakers and reading the written representations, it clearly was used. He said that there was no rubbish on the site and the residents were saying that the site was well used. Councillor Bright said that there was the potential of any decision made by the Planning Committee to be overturned but we would have a strong case for this application as the site provided amenity.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he didn't think the Planning Committee should be in the position they were in as estates should have cut the footpath out.

Mr Dixon sought clarification on the reasons for proposing to defer the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he had proposed deferral of the application in order for the issue of the footpath to be dealt with.

Councillor Patrick said that he would also like to know if the site was ever intended to be a play area.

RESOLVED - That the application be deferred.

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

Mr Chaplin left the meeting at this point.

Item 2 - DM/0108/24/FUL - Land Off Margaret Street, Immingham

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 referred Planning Committee members to the supplementary agenda which stated that condition one had been amended to allow for development to commence within five years. He said that the application was recommended for approval but as outlined in the supplementary agenda, the decision would then need to be delegated back to the Assistant Director for Regeneration to allow for the completion of a consultation period for the Ministry of Defence and subject to no objections being raised or prior to that confirmation from the Ministry of Defence of no objections.

Mr Wallwork spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that throughout the process, he had worked with the statutory consultees, residents and Immingham Town Council. Mr Wallwork said that there had been no objections to the application from any statutory consultees or Immingham Town Council. He explained that due to the feedback from Immingham Town Council, amendments had been made to the scheme and a new public right of way had been incorporated. Mr Wallwork said that Planning Committee members had the opportunity to support an application which would provide tangible benefits and would make the borough greener and a more environmentally friendly place to live and work. He said that the proposed development would help the Council realise its net zero aspirations, produce clean power and power the region. Mr Wallwork stated that the application was supported by local and national policy. He asked Planning Committee members to support the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he always tried to support solar energy developments. He said that he was pleased with the separation distances and the inclusion of trees and meadows. Councillor Hudson said that the proposed development was not permanent and would instead be there for a period of forty years, which would protect the land for that time. He stated that the proposed development was a good scheme. Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright agreed with Councillor Hudson. He did have concerns about the impact these types of developments might have on the countryside, but it was stated in the National Planning Policy Framework that these developments should be supported. Councillor Bright seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson didn't like how close the proposed development would be to Immingham, and he didn't think it should be that close. He queried what impact the proposed development would have in terms of noise.

Mr Limmer responded that it was his understanding that the noise would be at a low level and that there would also be mitigation in place.

Councillor Parkinson said that it might not be prime land but would cover a lot of acres. He said that despite his reservations; he would support the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Dixon said that on page fifty of the agenda papers, the agricultural land classification for the land that would be used was outlined. Mr Dixon clarified that some of the agricultural land that was included was classified as 3A land which was considered the best land there is.

Councillor Parkinson asked if the proposed development consisted of land that was all considered to be prime land, would planning officers still recommend the application for approval with conditions.

Mr Dixon responded that committee members needed to consider the application as it was. He stated that one of those considerations was the value of the land being used.

Councillor Kaczmarek stated that he was very supportive of the proposed development. He said that there would be plenty of trees planted and he saw no reason to object to the application. Councillor Kaczmarek said that the applicant had worked with the local community and all the boxes were ticked.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Parkinson left the meeting at this point.

Item 3 – DM/0605/24/FUL – 26 Sea View Street Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon stated that there was an unauthorised balcony at the rear of the property which was currently subject to an enforcement notice. He explained that were the application to be approved and implemented, officers would look to waiver that enforcement notice as the issue would be solved. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Redburn spoke as the agent for the application. She said that she had worked closely with the Planning Department and conservation officers. She said that a scheme had been proposed which was recommended for approval. Ms Redburn stated that there had been modifications made to the front elevation. She said that what was proposed would be harmonious and suit the street scene and that the proposed timber doors and windows would be more appropriate. Ms Redburn said that concerns had been raised regarding noise, but a noise management plan had been agreed with the relevant officers.

Councillor Hudson said that a lot of work had gone into the application and what was being proposed was an improvement. He said that the proposed development would also solve the enforcement issue. Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that he was baffled that the application hadn't got many representations. He said that there were issues with cars illegally parking in the area. Councillor Emmerson said that Sea View Street was traditionally a retail area but there were now more and more licenced establishments which had resulted in a drinking culture. He said that there had been noise issues in the area. Councillor Emmerson said that he did not want to see the venue go that way. He said that the applicant had also not bothered to attend the Planning Committee meeting.

Councillor Bright said that the owner and his conduct was not a material planning consideration. He said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson and that the proposed development would certainly be an improvement. Councillor Bright said that the Licensing Department was there if there were breaches by the premises.

Councillor Goodwin said that what was proposed would be an improvement. She said that she would support the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that there used to be about a 70/30 split down Sea View Street in terms of retail and restaurants and bars but now it was getting a bit too much the other way. However, he did think that what was proposed was an improvement.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Parkinson returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 4 - DM/1025/24/FUL - 17 Queens Parade, Cleethorpes

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 stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Hurst spoke in objection to the application. She said that she would be directly affected by the proposed extension. Ms Hurst said that she had lived in her property for forty years and whilst she was not against her neighbour extending their property, the amended application was for a two-storey extension which would affect her amenities and the natural daylight into her home. Ms Hurst stated that she objected to the two-storey extension based on material planning considerations such as loss of light, loss of outlook and massing. She said that the natural light going into her front room would be affected and whilst there was currently a small degree of restriction, the proposed development would make that obstruction worse. Ms Hurst said that she was also concerned about the proposed height of the extension and that it would cause massing. She said that the loss of daylight would be more significant than what the twenty-five-degree test would show. Ms Hurst asked the Planning Committee members to agree to a site visit to they would be able to see for themselves. She stated that she also had concerns regarding the window. Ms Hurst said that the proposed extension would make the situation worse and would create a feeling of enclosure. She said that the proposed two storey extension would be contrary to policies five and twenty-two of the local plan.

Mr Fox spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that he had bought the property in good faith. Mr Fox said that the reason for the proposed extension was to create a family sized bathroom. He said that the proposed extension was not being built to create another bedroom. Mr Fox said that he originally considered developing the basement but realised that it wouldn't work. He said that the property next door had an extension so he thought it would be okay for his property to also have one. Mr Fox said that the proposed extension had been designed to blend in with neighbour's properties. He said that there would not be an issue with light if the number fifteen had not built their extension. Mr Fox stated that he was trying to modernise the property and thought the proposed extension would improve the surrounding area.

Councillor Hudson said that the proposed extension would not go beyond the building line, and he had thought initially that it was straightforward application. He said that there would be a loss of light but would also be good separation. Councillor Hudson said that if members were wanting to visit the site, he would be happy to support that.

Councillor Parkinson said that the applicant's house was quite small, but the proposed extension would take some light away but was unsure to what degree. Councillor Parkinson stated that he would support the Planning Committee going on a site visit.

Councillor Lindley said that it was a fine line between what's acceptable and what's not. He said that when he initially looked at the application, he didn't think there was an issue, but he could now see why the neighbour wouldn't be happy with it. Councillor Lindley said that loss of view was not a material planning consideration. He said that he would support the Planning Committee going on a site visit.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be deferred in order to allow for a site visit to take place. This was seconded by Councillor Lindley.

Councillor Shutt said that light in terms of planning was not considered to be such a serious issue, and he wasn't sure that a site visit would make a difference. He said that he understood the objector's frustrations. Councillor Shutt said that the Planning Committee did sometimes undertake a site visit for their benefit and the public's benefit, but he didn't want to give anyone false hope.

Councillor Emmerson asked whether the application was allowed due to the premises being located in a conservation area.

Mr Dixon said that it would not have an effect, and the application was considered acceptable.

Councillor Bright agreed with Councillor Shutt. He asked whether the full light test had been done.

Mr Dixon responded that the applicant was asked if they were willing to do one, but they felt that they had submitted enough information. He said that there would be a potential impact, but the issue was whether that would be so detrimental that the application should be refused on amenity.

The committee took a vote and upon a vote, 5 voted for and 5 voted against the proposal of deferring the application for a site visit. The Chair's casting vote was to vote against the proposal.

Councillor Shutt proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Patrick stated that it was tough application to consider. He said that on balance he was not convinced that the proposed extension would cause enough of a detrimental impact to justify refusing the application. Councillor Patrick seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for 4 against with 1 abstention for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald left the meeting at this point.

Item 5 - DM/0086/25/FUL - Land Adj 64 Chapel Road, Habrough

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 stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the original planning application was approved subject to conditions. Mr Nelson said that his client had since received building costs for the project, and it was more economically viable to amend the scheme. He said that the revised layout was a betterment. Mr Nelson said that with the properties now linked, it provided more space on the outside. He said that the car parking provision would be retained to two spaces for each property. Mr Nelson said that the council's highways officer and drainage officer had not objected to the application. He said that what had previously been approved, could be built out and all that was being requested was a variation to that application.

Councillor Lindley said that he remembered the initial planning application and the current one was practically identical to the original apart from the dwellings being linked. He said that the parking provisions were the same as well as the landscaping. Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that he agreed with Councillor Lindley. He said that the objections were related to the principle of the development but that had already been established. Councillor Hudson said that his only issue with the proposed development was the limited access to the gardens.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with Councillor Lindley. He stated that he saw no reason to not approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he found the application quite intriguing as most people tended to want to make houses bigger, but what was proposed would make them more affordable. He said that he did agree with Councillor Hudson regarding the lack of access to the gardens and that would probably mean the bins would have to be located in the front.

Mr Limmer stated that the bins were proposed to be located at the side of the buildings.

Councillor Bright 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.)

Ms Hattle Fitzgerald returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 6 – DM/0990/24/FUL– 29 - 31 Chantry Lane, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon stated that a condition needed to be added outlining that prior to any occupation of any flat, final details regarding the finish and treatment of the parking and amenity area needed to be provided, including the provision and details of the bin storage area. He said that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Lindley said that the premise used to be a busy doctor's surgery, and this application would bring the premise back into use. He said that there had been substantial neighbour representations with objections raised regarding parking. Councillor Lindley said that parking had always been an issue in the area, but he thought it would have been more of an issue when the doctor's surgery was open. He said that he didn't think the proposed development would make a difference to parking in the area. Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with most of what Councillor Lindley had said. He said that he did have some reservations about the issue of parking.

Councillor Shutt was pleased to see that it was not to be a house in multiple occupancy and would instead be self-contained flats. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she was happy with the application.

Councillor Emmerson asked whether a condition could be added that there be larger bins for residents living in the flats as was done with other flats in the borough.

Mr Dixon responded that this would be addressed through the approved plans.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Patrick left the meeting at this point.

Item 7 - DM/0900/24/FUL - R/O 171 Mill Road, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from the Ward Councillor, Councillor Jervis. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon said that the proposed development would lead to an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of existing occupiers of adjoining properties and future occupiers. He stated that the application was recommended for refusal.

Mr Gande spoke in objection to the application. He said that he was speaking for the residents within Mill Road. Mr Gande objected to the application on grounds of rights of access and on privacy. He stated that residents on Trinity Road didn't want to be faced with a blank wall. Mr Gande also had concerns regarding drainage and run off water. He said that the garages at the site at the moment were mainly used for storage and he had estimated that there were around twenty-four vehicular visits a month, but if the application was approved and each dwelling had just one vehicle, that would mean a minimum of one hundred twenty vehicular visits each month. Mr Gande said that this would also lead to the junction becoming more dangerous and it was already a blind junction. He said that the junction was also used by people on the school run. Mr Gande said that the current access, should only allow serve up to five dwellings and this had already been exceeded as it served six dwellings and if the application were approved, it would be eight. He said that he also had concerns regarding vehicles being able to turn. Mr Gande referred to photos he had provided which showed an ambulance and how a tight a fit it was for that emergency vehicle. He said that if the dwellings were built, it would be worse.

Mr Burnett spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the site had a history of planning applications. Mr Burnett said that the material planning objections were very narrow. He said that this type of development was not out of place with the area and would improve the character of the area as there were currently concrete garages visible on Mill Road which were unsightly. Mr Burnett stated that the proposed development would positively enhance the appearance of the conservation area. He said that 3D visual images had been provided, and the applicant had gone to a considerable length to show how the buildings would replace the garages. Mr Burnett said that the buildings were not intended to be visually intrusive. He said that the roof style would be hipped and therefore lower the ridge. Mr Burnett said that there was no objection from statutory consultees to the principle of the development subject to conditions. He said that there were good bus connections in the area, and nearby schools. Mr Burnett said that similar projects in Cleethorpes had been approved. He said that the proposed scheme would create a place to live that was safe and sustainable.

Councillor Lindley said that he had always been sympathetic to houses being built in smaller plots, but he did think that the proposed

development overstepped the mark. He said that what was proposed was not in keeping with the area and in terms of parking it would be limited and whilst there was to be one garage there, families sometimes have two cars. Councillor Lindley said that he thought people would park in front and this would narrow the path to where people could safely negotiate their vehicles. He said that this would lead to the properties on Trinity Road facing a brick wall, which he didn't think would be particularly pleasing for residents. Councillor Lindley stated that the application site was too small and was inadequate for the proposed development. He didn't think there was the room for make any significant changes. Councillor Lindley said that he thought the proposed development would cause more problems than solve.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that the planning history showed that previous applications had been refused six times, with two appeals and both of those were dismissed. He said that the council's drainage officer had said no surface water should be discharged, but he was not sure where else it would go. Councillor Kaczmarek said that no windows were proposed to be on the side of the properties so just the front of the properties would have natural light and this was uncommon. He said that he agreed with Councillor Lindley that there would be a giant brick wall and whilst it was not particularly appealing now with garages there, they were at least not the size of a house. Councillor Kaczmarek said that he would be voting to refuse the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought the proposed development looked nice, but he didn't trust the scale. He said that he didn't think it could be built as proposed. Councillor Hudson didn't think the proposed development fitted in and agreed with the officer's recommendation.

Councillor Bright said that the application was called in and he didn't think it would have come before the Planning Committee without it being. He thought what was proposed was too much for the site. Councillor Bright did think the site could be developed but not as proposed. He said that he would be voting to refuse the application.

Councillor Shutt admired the architects design to squeeze in as much as possible but didn't think what was proposed was right. He agreed with Councillor Bright that there could be development on the site such as bungalows.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be refused. This was seconded by Councillor Kaczmarek.

Councillor Goodwin said that she didn't understand who would want a house with no windows to the side or the rear. She said that people also wouldn't want to face a wall. Councillor Goodwin said that more outside space was needed for the people living there. She said that bungalows might work on the site.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Item 8 – DM/0523/23/FUL – Willow Lakes, Ashby Hill Top Farm, Barton Street, Ashby Cum Fenby

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

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the site currently had holiday cottages, but the success of the site had driven the need for further lodges. Mr Snowden said that the need for holiday accommodation had grown, and this was shown with further development of Laceby Manor and the Brackenborough. He said that the proposed lodges would bring people into Willow Lakes and create local jobs. Mr Snowden said that the proposed lodges would not restrict views, and they would not be seen due to the hedges. He said that the site sat within flood zone one and the surface water would be managed, and this had been approved by the council's drainage officer. Mr Snowden said that discussions had taken place with the Environment Agency regarding foul water drainage, and they had raised no objection to the application. He said that the council's ecology officer had also not objected to the application. Mr Snowden said that the proposed scheme included significant landscaping. He said that tourism in the UK had changed and there was now more demand for lodges and Willow Lakes was a developing business.

Councillor Hudson said that he had sympathy for the parish council as the applicant already had planning permission for eighteen and he didn't understand why they would want more. He said that lodges always seem to be considered acceptable, but he did think they would be visible. Councillor Hudson said that he would have been able to understand the reason for the application if the eighteen lodges already approved had been built and there was further demand. He stated that there were also concerns about sewerage. Councillor Hudson said that he didn't see the need for more lodges until the eighteen lodges were built or more was offered at the site.

Councillor Bright said that the applicant was seeking planning permission for more lodges as they now had the funding. He said that there would be a hedgerow in between and he didn't think the additional lodges would have a detrimental impact. Councillor Bright said that conditions had been included that the lodges only be used for holiday purposes. He stated that he saw no reason to not approve the application.

Councillor Shutt asked whether if the lodges were built, and the applicant asked for more, could they then be changed to be residential homes as they would have planning permission.

Mr Limmer stated that Planning Committee members needed to consider the application as it was.

Councillor Shutt stated that he had no issue with the application and couldn't see a reason to refuse it.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he saw no reason to refuse the application. He said that he didn't think the fact that the previously approved eighteen lodges hadn't yet been built was a reason to refuse the application. Councillor Kaczmarek proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Goodwin said that people liked fishing, and she saw no reason to refuse the application. She said that the lodges would be separated from the village and as long as the lighting was low, she didn't see anything wrong with what was proposed. Councillor Goodwin seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson and didn't know why the applicant would want more lodges when the others hadn't yet been built. He queried whether condition eleven referred to external lighting as well.

Mr Limmer responded that condition eleven required that the final details regarding lighting be provided and agreed. He said that the council's ecology officer would be consulted.

Councillor Parkinson was concerned about the lighting being left on all night, as it would be disruptive. Councillor Parkinson asked if his concerns about that could be conveyed to the ecology officer.

Mr Limmer said that the ecologist would probably want low level lighting at the site. He said that a condition requiring the final detail regarding lighting was included as part of the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was unsure as he didn't know what the final detail regarding lighting would be and what would be agreed.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 7 for and 1 against with 1 abstention for the application was approved with conditions.)

P.86 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 March 2025 – 10th April 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.87 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.88 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.89 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 1.30pm.