



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

PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

24th March 2025 at 10.30 a.m.

Present

Councillor S Swinburn (in the Chair)

Officers in Attendance:

- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Martin Lear (Principal Transport Officer)
- Lorna McShane (Locum Solicitor)
- Anthony Snell (Transport and Traffic Manager)
- Helen Johnson (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)

Also in attendance:

- Councillor Patrick (Heneage Ward Councillor)

There were six members of the public and one member of the press in attendance at the meeting.

PH.HIT.46 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence for this meeting.

PH.HIT.47 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

PH.HIT.48 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport meeting on 10th February 2025 be agreed as a correct record.

PH.HIT.49 RESPONSE TO PETITION – TO REVOKE OR STOP A HOUSE OF MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY LICENCE FOR A PROPERTY ON DOUGLAS ROAD AND OTHER HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION

The Portfolio Holder considered a report in response to a petition submitted that requested a house in multiple occupancy be revoked/stopped on Douglas Road and other streets in this area.

Councillor Patrick read out a statement on behalf of the lead petitioner.

Mr Silkstone wrote that as the petition goes on, the strength of feeling from residents is that they want the house to be left as it is. He wrote that houses for multiple occupancy have the potential to cause issues regarding parking and fire safety. Mr Silkstone wrote that himself and Councillor Farren had consolidated their points and thought the effects on residents were worrying, particularly for single women, older couples and families. Mr Silkstone wrote that he would like the Portfolio Holder and officers to think of people living down the road as it would be residents that would hear any noise and could be potentially abused if they had to ask people to be quiet. Mr Silkstone wrote that one of his neighbours rented his house, so could move but he owned and would have to sell his home instead. He wrote that when he asked people if they would like to live next to a house for multiple occupancy, ninety nine percent of people said no.

Councillor Patrick spoke as Ward Councillor for the Heneage Ward. He said that there can be issues with houses of multiple occupancy such as traffic, noise and erosion of community, but it was not fair to say that all houses of multiple occupancy and all those living in them cause issues. Councillor Patrick stated that he was frustrated with the slow motion of the Council regarding houses of multiple occupancy, and it was now eleven years ago that Full Council had debated a motion regarding houses for multiple occupancy and it seemed that we were no further on now, than where we were then. Councillor Patrick said that whilst the Working Group gave him hope, it does seem to have now been hijacked by political issues. He said that he would like the Working Group to remind itself that it was a working group for the whole borough, and it needed to show positive meaningful outcomes for the whole borough.

The Portfolio Holder said that under the planning laws, the Council had no control regarding the particular house of multiple occupancy as it was classed as permitted development. The Portfolio Holder said that whilst some houses of multiple occupancy required planning permission, not all did. The Portfolio Holder stated that he would take the petition, and the residents' concerns to the Working Group and they would look into it. The Portfolio Holder said that residents can also report any environmental enforcement issues to the Environmental Enforcement team and any parking issues to the Highways Department. The Portfolio Holder stated that he could not revoke the house of multiple occupancy as planning permission wasn't needed. The Portfolio Holder said that whether any action could be taken in terms of selective licensing would be looked at. The Portfolio Holder said that he was a part of the Working Group and would raise the petition at the next meeting and provide feedback to residents via Democratic Services. The Portfolio Holder stated that he took on board the concerns of residents and the comments made and would make sure their concerns were heard.

Mr Silkstone asked whether anything could be done in terms of planning. The Portfolio Holder said that as long as they were complying with the planning laws and adhering to the rules of their licence, nothing could be done as they had permitted development rights. A resident raised concerns regarding soundproofing. The Portfolio Holder responded that, that was an issue that residents could raise with the Environmental Protection Team. Mr Silkstone said that there was nothing wrong with houses of multiple occupancy, but this was not in the right area. The Portfolio Holder responded that there was nothing the Council could do to stop the house of multiple occupancy but could deal with the other issues raised. The Portfolio Holder said that he would raise the petition at the Working Group and let them know resident's concerns and a response would be provided.

RESOLVED – The Portfolio Holder noted the report and forwarded the petition to the recently established Cabinet Working Group, who are considering a number of housing issues including HMO's in this area.

PH.HIT.50 THE BOROUGH OF NORTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL (OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2022 (AMENDMENT NO.9) REVOCATION ORDER 2025.

The Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking approval for the commencement of the formal consultation process for Revocation Order listed in Schedule 1 of this report, in accordance with the requirements of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

RESOLVED –

1. That the commencement of the formal consultation process for Revocation Order listed in Schedule 1 of this report be approved in accordance with the requirements of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
2. That subject to no objections being received, the making of the Revocation Order, as detailed in attached appendices be approved.
3. That if there were unresolved objections to the proposed Revocation Order, these be referred to the Portfolio Holder for determination and decision as to whether the Revocation Order be confirmed.

**PH.HIT.51 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 25-09 ORIGIN WAY,
HEALING - NO WAITING AT ANY TIME**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report proposing to make a Traffic Regulation Order to enable the Council to exercise their civil enforcement powers against anyone found parked in contravention of the existing 24-hour Prohibition of Waiting restrictions.

RESOLVED –

1. That the making of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to formalise the existing 24-hour Prohibition of Waiting (double yellow line) restrictions be approved, the extent of which is detailed in Appendix 1.
2. That in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Order, these be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed.

**PH.HIT.52 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 25-02: FREEMAN
STREET, GRIMSBY - WAITING AND LOADING
RESTRICTIONS**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that seeking approval for the making of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on Garibaldi Street, Freeman Street, Albert Street West, Railway Street, Nelson Street and Wood Street.

RESOLVED –

1. That the making of a Traffic Regulation Order be approved so that the waiting restrictions imposed on Garibaldi Street, Freeman Street, Albert Street West, Railway Street, Nelson Street and Wood Street shall be in accordance with the table and plans at Appendix 1 (Ref: ADHR – FS-01-01 & ADHR- FS-01-02).
2. That in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Order, these be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed.

**PH.HIT.53 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 24-06 GARTH LANE,
GRIMSBY – REVOCATION OF WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report proposing to revoke existing No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow line) restrictions on a section of Garth Lane, Grimsby.

RESOLVED –

1. That the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to revoke 24-hour Prohibition of Waiting (double yellow line) restrictions be approved, the extent of which is detailed in Appendix 1 (Ref: TR25-01-01).
2. That in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Order, these be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed.

There being no further business, the Portfolio Holder closed the meeting at 10.55am.