



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 29th July 2021

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17th June 2021

9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Harness (in the Chair)

Councillors Beasant, Batson, Croft, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Goodwin, Mickleburgh, Parkinson, Pettigrew and Silvester.

Officers in attendance:

- Jonathon Cadd (Senior Town Planner)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Highway and Transport Planner)
- Bev O'Brien (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Lawyer Property)
- Matthew Chaplin (Public Rights of Way Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Green – Sidney Sussex Ward Councillor
- Councillor Robinson – Sidney Sussex Ward Councillor
- Councillor Shreeve – Humberston/New Waltham Ward Councillor
- Councillor Shepherd – Scartho Ward Councillor

There were 8 members of the public present at the meeting.

P.1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

It was noted that at the Annual General Meeting of the Council held on 27th May, 2021 Councillor Harness had been appointed Chairman and Councillor Pettigrew had been appointed Deputy Chairman of this committee for the Municipal Year 2021/22.

P.2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received for this meeting.

P.3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Pettigrew declared a personal interest P.5 – Item 5 DM/0270/21/FUL as he was a member of Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Council.

P.4 APPLICATION OF DIVERSION OF PART OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH 2, GRIMSBY

The Committee considered a report on the making of a public path diversion order to divert parts of Public Footpath2, Grimsby.

Councillor Hudson believed that what the report was requesting was reasonable. He moved for the recommendation to be approved. Councillor Pettigrew seconded this.

RESOLVED – That an Order be made for the diversion of part of Public Footpath 2, to be diverted under the Highways Act 1980 section 119.

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as made be confirmed, subject to there being no objections, or in the event of objections which cannot be resolved and withdrawn, for the Order to be referred to the Planning Inspectorate for determination.

P.5 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

The committee considered a report from the for Environment, Economy and Resources regarding deposited plans and applications.

RESOLVED – That the deposited plans and applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act (Serial No's 1 – 12) be dealt with as set out below and detailed in the attached appendix.

1. Item One - DM/0389/21/FUL- Land adjacent Railway Crossing, Suggitts Lane, Cleethorpes

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that the application sought consent of construction of a new footbridge (with ramps and stairs) including lighting to facilitate the closure of Suggitt's Lane Level Crossing and associated works. Mr Cadd added there were additional supplementary papers that had been submitted late. In summary, he explained that construction of the bridge could mean that there would be some impact on wildfowl, however, he confirmed that these issues could be mitigated. He stated that Highways had accepted the proposal in principle and construction traffic would come from the North Promenade. They had worked hard with highways and have done a swept path analysis. This would help to see the time of days that would be best due to reduced traffic movements. He also added that in terms of issues with surface water, a soakaway system had been agreed in principle and if this application were approved, discussions would be held in terms of

privacy screens to cover the 8-metre upper and lower ramps. Mr Cadd explained that the proposed bridge would re-establish a link between Suggitts Lane and the estuary frontage that has been missed by residents for several years. In addition to this, the footbridge would also bring a fully accessible crossing to all. These were important benefits which weigh in favour of the proposal. However, weighed against the proposal were the impacts on amenity of a number of properties, including six facing properties at Suggitts Orchard. The size and positioning of the proposed bridge was such that its impacts cannot be mitigated and would completely dominate the rear private areas of these modest properties creating an unacceptably oppressive feature. In addition to this, the potential for noise and nuisance was a serious concern, both in terms of construction but also general usage. Such were the impacts it was considered that these issues alone justify a recommendation for refusal under policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (NELLP).

Mr Potterton spoke against the application. He explained that they have already had issues in early May where work had taken place 75 metres away from his adjacent property and after three days of work everyone's gardens were covered in thick black dust. Neighbours of his had their windows open which led to black dust all over the inside of their homes. Most of the residents were elderly and suffered from asthma or COPD. He stated that no one wants to breathe this sort of stuff in. Construction work was to start in the summer, which could mean windows and doors would not be able to be opened. There were to be no fewer than 9 trees surrounding close by properties to be removed. He explained how the trees provided habitat for colourful birds. If construction were to go ahead it would deprive the wildlife of its natural habitat. Mr Potterton said it was nice to see from their gardens. The trees provided privacy and a wind break. Mr Potterton explained that in September 2017 he returned from Blundell Park and experienced a high level of violence at the crossing between football supporters. However, this had all stopped since the crossing had been closed. If it were to be opened again there was potential for football supporters to cause violence again. It would give them ammunition to transfer football related violence to their back gardens.

Mr Murray spoke on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the proposal represented two years of hard work in collaboration with the Council and other stakeholders. However, it was worth it, if it meant to help implement a structure to help have access over the crossway. He explained that Network Rail decided to close the crossing and since doing so had looked at multiple options to reinstate. Mr Murray stated that plans in front of members represented a feasible, affordable and the most deliverable scheme. They had undertaken extensive consultation within community provided four internet and postal feedback questionnaire and over 600 completed surveys had been received with 70% being in support. They had listened to feedback received from residents to accommodate issues stated and to work intensively to ensure that there would be no impact to the environment. He pointed out that wherever this bridge would be

located there would always be anti-social behaviour concerns. Mr Clarke also spoke on behalf of the applicant and stated that the proposal in front of members was the preferred option and they had addressed concerns put forward. They hoped that they could reinstate an important link from Cleethorpes to the promenade. Mr Clarke added that anti-graffiti paint would be used to allow ease of cleaning and the installation of CCTV had received comments on how it would benefit the police if crime were to occur.

Councillor Robinson spoke as Ward Councillor for this application. He indicated how he strongly supported this application. He stressed how much residents wanted it and reminded colleagues how it had been televised with people being against its closure. He explained how it was heavily used before it had closed and a historic census stated that on average the bridge was used 570 times a day. There were 50 trains travelling every day using this track. That's why network rail had the need for it to be closed to ensure the safety of close by residents and users. He reminded the Committee that Network Rail didn't initially think it was suitable to spend so much to reinstate the bridge, but Martin Vickers lobbied to get funding help from the government. It was frequently used by elderly, joggers etc. He explained that when he was out speaking to residents' people had not left houses since the crossing was closed. Spoken to people who moved to the area for easy beach access and were disappointed that this had been stopped. Perception was that individuals would lose house value with the loss of access. He understood that there would be some impact during construction but if they worked together, he believed they would be able to mitigate any impact. He asked Members to approve the application.

Councillor Green also spoke as the Ward Councillor for this application. She stated that the presentation had answered several queries she was going to raise. As ward councillor she was here today to represent all residents in Grimsby and Cleethorpes. She stated that she could not speak against the crossing as she believed it would make a huge difference for lots of people as it would provide easy access to the beach. She understood that the development would bring many issues and that there was a need to consider impact on residents, particularly whether it should be in use when there was a football match taking place. She asked that if the application were to be approved that the bridge be closed around the times of football matches. She also asked for CCTV to be installed and to be opened and closed similar times to local park and recreational grounds. There were concerns over the appearance of the bridge but wondered whether after construction there would be the opportunity to reintroduced some planting to disguise the bridge for close by residents. She believed consideration needed to be given to the appearance to blend in with area. Another issue Councillor Green pointed out was parking. Previously people would avoid parking to avoid fees when parking near the beach. This could produce lots of issues for residents and may be appropriate to introduce a parking permit scheme. She wondered whether there were other options available so that it didn't have such a negative effect on residents.

Mr Cadd explained that the principle of providing a new safe crossing wasn't of concern. The Key aspect was the scale and its impact on adjoining people. The wider community have a positive conception of the scheme, but this would have a detrimental effect on a number of properties close by. He asked Members to carefully consider this when weighing up their decision to approve.

Councillor Mickleburgh believed a lot of hard work had been put into this application. He recognised that there was a level of support to see the return of a level crossing, but unfortunately this could not be an option. He stated that it would be a large footbridge as it had to be made disabled friendly and he supports social inclusion. However, there were objections that needed to be considered. He proposed that Members have a site visit to see the issues themselves.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she was not against having a bridge, but wondered whether the applicants could look at a different design i.e. a design with a lift. She believed it would do the job and be neat. She believed the proposal would have too much impact on residents. It was a big monstrosity. It needed to be something fairer to residents. She believed that residents did need a bridge, but there was also a need for a better design.

Councillor Hasthorpe believed this to be a difficult planning matter. Residents been very vocal on issues they had towards this proposal. He believed it would be difficult to put a time on the local barrier system. It was an ugly design but it was impossible to see the true extent to what residents would see.

Councillor Hudson thought it was an interesting idea for lift to be installed. However, it must have been thought of as it had taken 3 years to get to this stage. A lot of effort had gone in to getting us here. Majority of people want the bridge. He wondered whether we override issues for the greater good. He liked to think that it was not as unattractive as people were making out. Colour looked good. Lighting at night looked good. He believed that the issues with objectors could be overridden. It would be beneficial if gates on match days could be closed and policed constantly. He stated that a lot of effort had gone into this proposal, but in doing so they have to make sure they do everything they can for residents to make it better for them.

Councillor Parkinson thought this was an extreme case. Huge gap between those that want it and those that don't. He didn't think they would benefit from a site visit. He wondered about the cleansing regime and dealing with litter. He also wondered whether there was increased flood risk. Mr Cadd confirmed that as the application was for a bridge there would be limited impact and a drainage scheme has been agreed with the applicant.

Councillor Pettigrew thought it was difficult decision to make. A lot of work had been done. However, he completely felt for residents, but understood how it would bring massive benefit to the area. He wondered whether they could look at how they can mitigate negative points. Noise, dust etc. He believed it could be addressed. Gates on match day should be looked at. He wanted to make sure that if a privacy screen was to be installed they had to make the screen acceptable. He agreed that he didn't think a site visit would be beneficial.

Councillor Goodwin asked if a lift had been considered.

Mr Cadd stated that a lift had been looked at but Members had to bear in mind that it was a populated location. It could make the lift and infrastructure vulnerable to misuse and would be quite costly to install and maintain.

Councillor Hasthorpe believed the benefits outweighed the negatives. He wondered whether the tree's removed could be replaced once the bridge had been installed.

Mr Cadd added that there was no room for any substantive planting. There could be on the riverside, but it wouldn't have any beneficial impact. He reminded Members that it was important to consider whether something can be legally possible. Planting was not something that was legally required.

Councillor Parkinson wondered whether trees could be planted on resident's land if it was something they wanted to go along with.

Mr Cadd stated that this was not part of the planning process, particularly getting something approved on someone else's land without prior agreement. Mr Dixon added that Members needed to be mindful of the room in residents' gardens. If this were to happen it would take up a big part of their already modest gardens.

Councillor Mickleburgh withdrew his motion for a site visit. Instead, he moved that the application be approved. He stated that there was a demand for the crossing. It was not ideal, but it had taken two years to get to this stage. Councillor Hudson seconded this proposal.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that the conditions needed to be discussed before approval.

Mr Dixon suggested that if Members were to approve the application it be subject to the resolution of issues stated today. He advised that if Members were happy that the matter be delegated to officers to look into the resolution of matters in relation to construction management, designing out crime and ecology.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved subject to resolution of matters in relation to construction management, designing out crime and

ecology; with the decision to approve delegated to Assistant Director of Housing, Highways and Planning.

In the event that the matters cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the application was to go back to planning committee for a decision.

(Note - the committee voted nine to two for the application to be approved.)

Item Two - DM/0424/21/PAT - Land at junction of Eleanor Street and Convamore Road, Grimsby

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained it sought permission to add a 15.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wraparound Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works. MR Cadd explained that it was accepted that the mast would fall within the required emission standards for telecommunications apparatus required through guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Similarly, the mast's siting and appearance would not have an unduly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, the character of the conservation area nor the setting of a listed building. Moreover, it's siting would not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity or highway safety. Therefore, the proposal was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hudson thought the proposal was essential for its infrastructure. He moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Hasthorpe seconded this.

Councillor Parkinson thought it was necessary. He was happy we this application.

Councillor Batson was concerned that it was only for a single mast. They seem to be implemented all over the town and the company keep adding to it.

Councillor Beasant thanked residents for taking the time to object. He stated that these boxes were nearly all over and tend to be graffitied on. He thought it was about time they thought of another plan to install the masts.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, with attached conditions mentioned in the report.

(Note - the committee voted eight to three in favour of this application being approved.)

Item Three - DM/1038/20/FUL- Healing Village Hall, Great Coates Road, Healing Grimsby

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained it sought change of use from village hall to a members' only food sales outlet (sui generis)

use. The use of the premises as a member only retail use was not deemed to harm community facilities within Healing as an enhanced facility elsewhere in the village has permission and work was scheduled to start in July. In the intervening period the hall would be rented back by the Parish to allow activities to continue. Similarly, as a restricted members only retail use, it would fall outside of the usual planning use classes and would not therefore be required. The development, however, would be located in busy and congested location, close to the entrance to Healing Academy where children arrive and leave in large numbers. In highway terms, therefore this was a significant concern in safety terms and that of capacity. Vehicle turning into and out of the site at these times, (including servicing) could therefore detract from safety and weigh against the proposal in any planning balance. The applicant has, however, provided details based on existing operations that vehicle movements would not be high, that vehicles could turn within the site, parking space numbers would be sufficient, and servicing could also be undertaken within the site. This together with conditions limiting net retail floor area and the use would be sufficient to limit activity to acceptable levels that allow a recommendation for the application to be granted.

Mrs Dewland, Headteacher of Healing Academy, spoke in objection to this planning application. She explained that the Academy surrounds the subject property. It was currently a village hall, and its usage was reasonably low. There was in excess of 1200 pupils at the Academy and hosts a large number of visitors coming to the site. Her overriding and only concern was the safety of her pupils and staff. There had been numerous 'near misses' close to school. Granting permission would encounter more issues closer to the site. She stated that there needed to be a delivery point assessment as when the delivery access was measured against risk levels it came out as red, the most concerning one. She did not think the risk report could be ignored. Concerns had been raised directly with the school enquiring about the traffic volume and flow. The school have worked with Engie to reduce the traffic volume, but if this application was approved the school had major concerns that traffic would become more extensive. Shocked and astounded that reports of traffic flow had been provided at such late notice, especially as it was Engie who instigated action be taken regarding traffic close by to the school. The highway reports showed conflicting views on volume of visitors. Mrs Dewland pointed out that this facility already existed elsewhere, she wondered why it needed to move so near to a school site. She explained that the site was zoned and manned for educational use. She asked Members to not ignore their duty of care, the risk factors and numerous near misses may eventually result in a fatality.

Mr Glass, spoke as the applicant of the application. He explained that her was the owner of property, and the application was for a very low profiled arrangement. However, felt the need to put in a proper application. There were valid concerns from objection i.e. Transport and access, but if approved he stated that he would continue to work personally with individuals to make sure issues were being mitigated.

Mr Cadd explained that it was the Parish Council who had taken measurements of vehicle movements. He confirmed that the site was in an urban area. Outside the educational premises, but the education area did surround it. He explained that the nature of membership wasn't something anyone can just apply for. It works on a different basis compared to normal retail store. It was more around supporting schooling facilities within the area, meaning a very limited number of people would visit.

Ms Hattle stated that a thorough assessment on site traffic and road safety had been taken by Officers. They were aware of various issues, but the numbers that have been generated on car movements before were considerably lower. She stated that as this was to be a retail store that would only be used by a handful of people, they did not see any issues with traffic movement.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he knew the site well. He had no concerns about the use of the building, but his only concern was for the school pupils and residents gaining access to and from site. He explained that there was currently a sliding gate when gaining access to the village hall. A standard car would have to park to open the gate, which would mean it would protrude a busy road and cycle path. He believed the gates should be moved back into site for safety. Vehicles would still be able to turn on the site. He moved for the application to be approved with the condition that the gates were moved.

Councillor Hudson stated that there had been a previous application for a shop, which was withdrawn. He did not think the business would affect the school. He seconded the motion for the application to be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh was happy to go along with the application if the gates were moved.

Mr Cadd stated that the difficulty was that it was a very limited car park. May lose ability to manoeuvre if gates were to take one of the spaces. Service vehicles may also find it hard to use. He explained that the nature of the store would mean that the number of vehicles waiting would be very limited.

Councillor Parkinson believed that the only issue with the gate was if deliveries were done before opening times.

Ms Hattle stated that they had spoken to the applicant, and they confirmed that deliveries would call an hour ahead to make someone was there to accept them.

Mr Cadd explained that there may be difficulties in moved the gate via a condition. He was happy to go back to the applicant to look at it in more detail and bring it back to Committee following further negotiations.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to a future Planning Committee for further negotiations with the applicant.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being deferred.)

Councillor Mickleburgh left the meeting at this point.

Item Four - DM/0207/21/FUL- 19 Grant Street, Cleethorpes North-East Lincolnshire DN35 8AT

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained it sought change of use from a Guest House to a house of multiple occupancy (HMO) and associated internal alterations. As the proposal was located within the development area of Cleethorpes and the principle of additional residential accommodation in this area was supported. Residential amenity concerns were noted but amended plans provide a layout which would meet the Housing Teams standards along with natural light to each habitable room and access to outdoor amenity areas. Similarly, whilst a more intensive form of development it would not be dissimilar to the guest house capacity when full and would not therefore appear out of keeping in terms of density. Finally, the site was located within a highly sustainable area reducing the reliance on motor vehicles. The proposal was therefore, recommended for approval.

Councillor Hudson thought it was an adequate request. He moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Hasthorpeudson seconded the movement.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the report.

(Note - the committee voted nine to one in favour of this application being approved)

Item Five - DM/0270/21/FUL- Land Adj. Field Gates, Post Office Lane Ashby Cum Fenby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought permission for change of use of agricultural land to equine use including ancillary sheds. He stated that equine use was a common activity in rural areas and would be in keeping with its surroundings. There would be no negative impacts on the character of the area, neighbouring amenity or ecology. The application was considered to be in accordance with Policy 5 and 22 of the NELLP 2018 and was recommended for approval.

Mr Dieter Nelson spoke on behalf of the applicant. He explained that the applicant had numerous paddocks located across the borough particularly for horse grazing, but the site in question was on the edge and would be of no conflict. When the applicant realised, they needed planning permission for grazing horses, the application was quickly applied for. He

explained that there was a clear demand for horse grazing land. Horses would be collected twice a week and taken away from the paddock. The horse field would be fenced off to avoid any occurring damage. Ecology Officer had no issues. Mr Nelson explained that sheep could graze there without planning consent. No objections had been received from any technical consultees. He hoped the application would be approved in line with the Officers report.

Councillor Hasthorpe believed objections raised had been covered. He moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Hudson seconded this.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the report and an additional condition for final details of the disposal of manure to be submitted and agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being approved)

Item Six - DM/0218/21/FUL - Land former Welbeck, Waltham Road, Brigsley.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought full planning permission to erect one detached dwelling with roof lights, detached garage/store and detached BBQ building 1 detached dwelling with Juliet balcony, roof lights and detached garage, boundary treatments and associated works. In conclusion, it was considered that the proposed development would not cause any undue harm to the neighbouring properties residential amenity with particular regard to overlooking, loss of privacy, traffic generation and noise and disturbance. The proposal would also not cause undue harm in terms of visual amenity, highway safety and amenity and flood risk. It was therefore, recommended for approval.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that he was at the Parish Council meeting when this was discussed. The issue was the gravel drive causing noise, but he felt that this had been dealt with. He thought the site was well laid out and plans were well designed. He moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Hasthorpe seconded this.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the report.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being approved.)

Item Seven - DM/0023/21/FUL - 16 Radcliffe Road, Healing

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought a variation of Conditions 2, 3, 4 and 5 as granted on DM/0461/20/FUL including alterations to roof layout, side ground and first floor extension removed,

side window added at first floor, brickwork to render at first floor, front door at ground floor changed to window and installation of bi-folding doors to ground floor to rear. The proposal did not harm the site's visual amenities and did not harm neighbouring amenity. Details regarding drainage had been considered and accepted. As such, the proposal was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be approved.
Councillor Hudson seconded this.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the condition included within the report.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being approved)

Item Eight - DM/1116/20/FUL - Land Adj. 401 Louth Road, New Waltham, North-East Lincolnshire

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought for the erection of 9 dwellings with garages, access and associated works. The site could suitably accommodate 9 dwellings without adversely affecting residential amenity, the character of the area or impacting upon highway safety or drainage. The proposal would also not give rise to negative issues in terms of ecology, landscaping or archaeology. It was therefore considered that the proposal complied with the policies within the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) and the NPPF 2019, and was recommended approval.

Mr Daniel Snowden spoke on behalf of the applicant, and he explained how there had been no objections received from any of the technical consultees and stated that the site had never flooded. He explained that the Parish Council had raised concerns, but the applicant has cleaned the dyke out to allow better drainage. The access was in a good place. It was a local developer and had previously built successful developments.

Councillor Harness stated that he had every respect for Parish Council, but he disagreed with their comments.

Councillor Hudson moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Hasthorpe seconded this.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the report.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being approved)

Item Nine - DM/0431/21/FUL - Plot 1 Kings Chase Barnoldby Le Beck North-East Lincolnshire

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought a variation of Condition 2 as granted on DM/0311/20/FUL to amend layout and design. This application sought to modify an earlier approval, which sought to erect three detached dwellings with garages to include new access, parking and landscaping. The modifications proposed in this application were considered to be of an acceptable scale and nature and do not fundamentally alter the original design concept or create any significant additional impacts to the character of the area or to neighbours. It was therefore, recommended for approval.

Mr Snowden spoke on behalf of the applicant. He explained that they had received an objection from the Parish Council. He stated that prior to submitting the revised drawing, the applicants spoke to the neighbours who now support it.

Councillor Hasthorpe can't see where the Parish Council were coming from. He moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Pettigrew seconded the movement.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the report.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being approved)

Item Ten - DM/0462/21/FUL - Flat 5, 1-5 Corporation Road, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought the creation of additional storey with roof lift to provide an additional bedroom. In conclusion, it was considered that the proposed development would accord with policy 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018) and sections 12 and 14 of the NPPF. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe believed this would improve the property. He moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Hudson seconded the movement.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the report.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being approved)

Item Eleven - DM/0276/21/FUL - 32 Humberston Avenue, Humberston, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought an outline application to erect 1 dwelling and garage with means of access to be considered. The proposed development, in principle, would not lead to

demonstrable harm to the living conditions of neighbours, nor would it unduly impact on the character and appearance of the area. The means of access was acceptable in highway safety and amenity regards. He stated that the proposal was recommended for approval as final details of layout, appearance, scale and landscaping would be considered at the reserved matters stage.

Mr Daniel Snowden spoke on behalf of the application. He explained that the application had previously received three approvals. Health stopped the applicant from renewing but as the applicant was better now, they have reapplied. The site was acceptable for development and was not back land.

Councillor Harness explained that Parish Council try to reserve the character of Humberston Avenue. He said he knew the plot well.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Hudson seconded the movement.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the report.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being approved)

Item Twelve - D M/0374/21/FUL - 54 Tetney Road, Humberston North-East Lincolnshire DN36 4JF

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought the installation of summer house with side porch. The outbuilding was of a reasonable size, scale and appearance and would not lead to any undue impacts on the neighbouring properties amenities or the character and appearance of the area. The application was therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the NELLP 2018 and was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Pettigrew seconded the movement.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the report.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously in favour of this application being approved)

P.4 PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Director of Economy and Growth under delegated powers during the period 16th April 2021 to 2nd June 2021.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.5 PLANNING APPEALS

The committee received a report from the Director of Economy and Growth regarding outstanding planning appeals.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.6 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.7 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The committee discussed issues relating to enforcement and raised a number of matters for further investigation.

RESOLVED – That the information be noted, and further investigations be carried out as requested.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 1:15 p.m.