



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 18th March 2021

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6th January 2021

9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Harness (in the Chair)

Councillors Beasant, Hasthorpe, Hudson, James (from P59 – Item three), Mickleburgh, Nichols, Parkinson, Pettigrew, and Silvester.

Officers in attendance:

- Lauren Birkwood (Senior Town Planner)
- Rob Close (Scrutiny and Committee Support Officer)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Highway and Transport Planner)
- Richard Limmer (Major Projects Planner)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Lawyer Property)

P57 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Goodwin this meeting.

P.58 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All members of the committee acknowledged their personal interest in knowing the applicant of P.59 - item six.

Councillor Pettigrew declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in P.59 - items two and six.

Councillor Hudson declared a prejudicial interest in P.59 – item two as the applicant was a friend.

P.59 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

The committee considered a report from the Director of Economy and Growth regarding deposited plans and applications.

RESOLVED – That the deposited plans and applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act (Serial No's 1 – 7) be dealt with as set out below and detailed in the attached appendix.

Item One - DM/0487/20/OUT - Land Adj. South View Humberston

Ms Birkwood introduced the application and explained it sought outline permission for the erection of up to 14 dwellings on land at South View in Humberston. She showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following objections received from residents and Humberston Parish Council.

She explained that the development was located within the boundary of Humberston so was in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2018 and, therefore, acceptable in principle. In addition, the site was allocated for housing within the NELLP 2018, however this application only made up half the allocated site. The full allocation identified the site as having capacity for 17 houses, although this figure was only indicative. Even though layout and scale were reserved for future consideration, the indicative layout drawing was considered to relate well to the surrounding features and would remain residential in character. The application was judged to constitute more of an infill extension to the current built form in terms of scale. Concerns were raised by Humberston Parish Council and residents, surrounding highways and accessibility issues. Access was proposed from South View. Highways officers had worked closely with the applicant, and were content that an addition of up to 14 dwellings would not impact on the adopted highways network. A turning head facility along South View would enable refuse vehicles and residents to undertake relevant manoeuvres. South View was 5 metres in width and the new road to be adopted would be 5.5 metres. Each property would benefit from off street parking. Humberston Parish Council and residents also raised objections regarding flood risk and drainage. The site was not within a flood risk area, so the risk of flooding wasn't considered to be undue. However, sustainable methods had been included in submission such as swales, water butts and permeable paving. In addition, the indicative layout also indicated the existing drainage ditch to the north would be retained. Further detail would be offered within a reserve matters application. Comments had been received raising concerns about the impact to residential amenity. Again, detailed design matters would form part of the reserve matters application. A good portion of the allocated housing site would remain undeveloped, consequently offering no impact to residents to the east. All other neighbours benefited from sufficient separation distances with the indicative layout. In addition, the presence of existing roads and landscaping would minimise issues of visual intrusion and overlooking. Noise, dust and dirt was also raised as issues by Humberston Parish Council and residents. These issues would form part

of the reserve matters consideration. Although the Environmental Health Officer raised no concerns. Negotiations had taken place with the Ecology Officer resulting in no specific issues being highlighted, although further survey work and measures for bats. Policy 41 of the NELLP 2018 stated:

Any development which would result in significant harm to biodiversity which cannot be avoided should be adequately compensated for.

On that basis, the Ecology Officer has recommended an area of land close to the site to mitigate loss of habitat connectivity. That being Cleethorpes County Park. This would be secured through a financial contribution to create an orchard. No badgers were identified on this site. A small area of open space would be located close to the entrance of South View for existing and future residents. A management plan and ongoing maintenance of the area would be secured through conditions. The detailed landscape scheme would form part of the reserve matters application; however, trees and hedging would be allocated within the site along streets, boundaries, and open space. The hedge to the north of the site was to be retained. The Heritage Officer confirmed that the site sat within an archaeological area. On this basis, a scheme of archaeological work had been recommended. Comments had also been raised in terms of ownership and convenience of the site, this was not a planning matter. Although, further investigation revealed that North East Lincolnshire Council were the owners of the site. The applicant had committed to financial contributions to both primary and secondary education, and to provide 20 per cent affordable housing. Ms Birkwood confirmed that on the basis, the application was recommended approval, subject to safeguarding conditions.

Mr Dixon also clarified that the recommendation is approval subject to the completion of the necessary Section 106 agreement with the issuing of the decision delegated to the Director for Economy and Growth.

Ms Wells was invited to address the committee in her capacity as the applicant for this proposal. Outline planning permission was chosen to help shape the development and ensure it complimented the surroundings, therefore lessening the impact on local residents. The site would then be put up for sale allowing developers to submit a bid, supporting the local economy and promoting growth of jobs. Many amendments had been made since the original application in 2019, the number of dwellings had been reduced by 22 per cent, the layout had been adjusted to avoid underground utilities, ensuring the subsequent developer provided a detailed surface and foul drainage proposal, and extensive consultation had taken place with officers discussing issues of highways, ecology, and drainages. The site comprised of dormer bungalows with only six detached houses in the endeavour of lessening the impact to the local neighbourhood. The site benefitted from increased green space which was a more aesthetic approach. A minimal number of properties now backed onto the site. The rear gardens had been extended to provide sufficient space between each property. A full

assessment of South Way highway had been completed and the route from North Sea Lane could be accommodated. This formed part of the review to the original site plan. A flood risk assessment had been completed with the incorporation of compliant SUDs. The ecological survey was undertaken resulting in more trees being intended to be retained compared to the original plan. A minimum number of hedgerows were intended to be removed. The convenient was a positive convenient and didn't run with the land, resulting in it being unable to be enforced.

Councillor Shreeve was invited to address the committee in his capacity as a Humberston and New Waltham Ward Councillor. He noted that a significant number of objectors were actually local to South View. Councillor Shreeve stressed how apparent residential concern for this application was to him, after he had taken place in a consultation. Although some objections were addressed, the principal concerns of access and egress into the site, the threat to wildlife and protected species, historical significance, the impact to the character of the village, and the potential for overlooking. He appreciated that the applicant had made effort to address these concerns within the revised plans, however, these amendments were not to the satisfaction of residents.

Councillor Pettigrew left the meeting at this point following connectivity issues.

The Chair noted that although the site was allocated for housing within the NELLP 2018, it was very unpopular with current residents. He stated that there was a more general concern that Humberston was being overdeveloped and this site should be spared. He had carried out extensive consultation with officers, ward councillors, and residents. He appreciated the scheme had improved upon revision, however the uncertainty that came as a result of a mere outline application was of worry. His doubts surrounding this application came from his skepticism of the suitability of South View being the gateway to this development.

Councillor Hasthorpe referred to the comment made by Humberston Parish Council suggesting that North East Lincolnshire Council donate the land to them to ensure that ownership remained with the residents of Humberston, he questioned if Humberston Parish Council had formalised this request. The Chair was unaware if this had been formalised, however he noted that there was ongoing uncertainty as to the upkeep of the land in its current open space form.

In a supplementary comment, Councillor Hasthorpe stressed that he wasn't satisfied that accessibility to the site hadn't been appropriately addressed. In addition, noted the significant number of objections received. He moved that this application be refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh felt that the sheer number of objections from residents and Humberston Parish Council carried significant weight. Echoing Councillor Hasthorpe's comments, he seconded the motion to refuse this application.

Ms Hattle stressed that all necessary assessments had been undertaken and South View was considered to be sufficient width to sustain this site. The 5.5 metres available was considered to be more than adequate for refuse vehicles. A bin storage area was included for the few dwellings that were accessed from the private drive. She added that she had no concerns that the 14 dwellings were have significant impact on the junction with South View or North Sea Lane.

Mr Dixon noted that the 14 units sitting off an adopted road was a far from uncommon situation. In addition, he stressed that the site had been allocated for housing within the NELLP 2018. This application wouldn't preclude Humberston Parish Council taking over the management and ownership of the land.

Councillor Parkinson was uncomfortable with refusing this application with no alternative for the land. He acknowledged that although it may be a unfortunate that the land ended up being only used for housing, there wasn't any viable other option for its use. He didn't share the concerns surrounding highways safety and amenity.

Councillor Hudson agreed with Councillor Parkinson's comments, although he was disappointed with the diminishing green space throughout Humberston.

Councillor Nichols hoped that the management of this land did eventually pass to Humberston Parish Council to ensure the protection of local wildlife.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as the proposed development would result in an adverse impact on the highway accessing the site to the detriment of highway safety and amenity in conflict with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

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

Councillors Hudson and Pettigrew left the meeting at this point.

Item Two - DM/0955/20/OUT- Land At, Grimsby Road, Waltham.

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought outline permission for the erection of up to 17 dwellings on land adjacent to Grimsby Road in Waltham. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following a request by Councillor Brookes.

He noted that an outline application on this site was refused, before being dismissed at appeal, in 2018 for a very similar development. The

site sat outside of the development boundary for Waltham, and was unallocated within the NELLP 2018. Out of boundary residential development wasn't supported within the NELLP 2018, therefore the principle of development wasn't considered to be acceptable or sustainable. The properties however would be reasonably well separated, consequently the impact on residential amenity of this development wasn't considered to be of significance. Highways safety and amenity wasn't considered to take an undue impact if this development were to be implemented. The scheme could be implemented with a sustainable drainage scheme with the incorporation of SUDs. The application was submitted without an ecology assessment, the potential impact to the site's ecology was thus unknown. Without this assessment the scheme would be contrary to policy 41 of the NELLP 2018. Incidentally, the impact to ecology was listed as a reason for refusal in the previous scheme. The impact to heritage also hadn't been assessed. Development on this site would therefore be contrary to policy 39 of the NELLP 2018. Two pipelines sat to the north of the site, and the scheme as submitted wouldn't interfere or effect the amenity of the pipeline occupiers. Mr Limmer confirmed that this development was considered a risk to the character of the area and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Deakins was invited to address the committee in his capacity as the agent for this proposal. He acknowledged that the site sat outside of the development boundary for Waltham, however, he referred to North East Lincolnshire Council's five-year housing supply which he speculated was distinctly down. Because of this circumstance, he stated that sites such as this should be seriously considered for housing. He stated the applicant didn't feel in any way, that this development would erode the gap between Grimsby and Waltham. The existing end of Waltham towards Grimsby Road already extended further than this site. The distance from the tip of the site, as proposed, to the first house in Grimsby, sat a gap of 250 metres which, he felt, was a substantial. In addition, the pipeline that sat within that gap offered a strong probability of the retention of that open space. The woodland planting strip to the north of the site, offered screening from Grimsby and the wider view. He considered the scheme to offer a betterment to the view of the village coming into Waltham. He stressed the situation from this application compared to the, refused by committee and dismissed at appeal, previous application was significantly different because of the ample housing availability at that time. In addition, this site was now contextualised against neighbouring sites of similar design and scale. Subject to a reserve matters application, the applicant expected to be able to deliver this application reasonably quickly. Foul surface water drainage, services, roads, and paths were already in place ready for the construction of properties. The scheme included affordable units and two wheelchair accessible units which were sought after by the local housing association. The applicant was one of the few developers in the area who was building solely bungalows which, again, were very sought after.

Mr Limmer noted that currently, North East Lincolnshire Council could actually demonstrate a five-year supply of housing.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved that this application be refused as per officers' recommendation. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded Councillor Hasthorpe's motion of refusal.

Councillor Parkinson acknowledged his typical support of strategic gaps; however, he felt this application rounded off the wider area nicely. He was particularly impressed with the tree boundary. Although he felt sympathy for the applicant, he considered this application had too many issues.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as:

1. The proposed residential development would extend into the open countryside and have a significantly detrimental impact on the visual character and appearance of the area. The proposed development therefore represented an unsustainable form of development in the countryside. No sufficient special reason has been given to justify the siting of this residential development in this location. North East Lincolnshire did not have a shortfall in housing supply. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to the requirements of policies 5, 22 and 40 of North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) and the core principles as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
2. The development had not been assessed in terms of ecology. There was therefore insufficient evidence to allow for a full consideration of the potential impacts on biodiversity and without such an assessment the proposal was contrary to Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 and advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
3. The development had not been assessed in terms of heritage and archaeology. There was insufficient evidence to allow for a full consideration of the potential impacts on heritage and archaeology and without such an assessment the proposal was contrary to Policy 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013- 2032 and advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

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

Councillors Hudson and Pettigrew re-joined the meeting at this point.

Item Three - DM/0851/19/FUL - 41 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought the erection of a single storey rear extension to include two roof lights, the erection of a detached double garage, and the installation of new front

boundary treatments to include a 1.8-metre-high timber gate, two 2-metre-high stone pillars and related 1-metre-high fencing with hedging behind and pedestrian gate. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following the number of neighbouring objections.

He explained that although there were a number of objections, officers had worked closely with the applicant to overcome these issues resulting in a relocation of the garage to a more sympathetic position and best efforts to retain the hedging. He noted that the hedge wasn't under a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Although two trees to the front of the site would be removed, additional planting was proposed. The separation distances to neighbours were considered to be acceptable. Mr Limmer confirmed that the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved approval of this application. Councillor Pettigrew was satisfied that this application wouldn't affect the street scene or neighbouring amenity. He suggested that it would benefit neighbours by taking vehicles off the road. He felt that the repositioning of the garage was much more acceptable. Councillor Pettigrew seconded Councillor Hasthorpe's motion of approval.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with the attached conditions.

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

Item Four - DM/0896/20/FUL - 68 Weelsby Road, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought permission to erect a single storey extension to include the installation of rooflights. The materials proposed would match that of the existing property in terms of rendered walls and grey slate roof. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following neighbouring objections.

He noted that a number of objections referenced the guttering on the property not overhanging, the applicant had confirmed that it won't. The works were to an existing residential property and were to the back of the property. The works would be well screened and only sat at single story, therefore, the design and character of the application was considered acceptable. A number of objections were received relating to the impact of the hipped roof extension to the neighbour at 70 Weelsby Road. A light test had been carried out by the applicant and after extensive discussions with the applicant, officers' were satisfied that an objection based on adverse impact wasn't appropriate. Some reference had been made by objectors to a previously refused application in 2008, but when compared to this application, the works weren't considered to be unreasonably. Objections were received in relation to the Party Wall Act

1996; however, this didn't form part of planning consideration. Mr Dixon confirmed the application was recommended for approval.

Ms Taylor was invited to address the committee in objection to this proposal. She noted that the previous attempt to propose a rear extension was refused. She considered the height of the massing of the extension to be unacceptable as she feared it would cause significant light reduction and would create a tunnel into her living room. The drainage would require a soakaway, after contacting a previous owner of the site she was made aware a soakaway hadn't been installed. The Anglian water map for two of the three properties, she believed, was incorrect as it omitted the combined sewage surface drain to 68 Weelsby Road. The applicant's response to her objection centred, she felt, on irrelevant photographs and reference to seating that wasn't in question. She suggested revising the scheme to be less impactful to her property.

Councillor Woodward was invited to address the committee in her capacity as a Park Ward Councillor. Whilst extending up to six metres fell under the neighbour consultation scheme, this was the absolute maximum of such an extension. In framing the legislation, she stated it was understood that such an extension may impinge upon the neighbours for a variety of reasons which may include disruption from the proximity of the building works, impact upon privacy but, most importantly, that the size and the bulk of the extension would have a significant impact on the neighbouring property. She believed that these conditions applied in this case. She felt the proposed extension would result in a narrow, six metre tunnel between the two properties. This could result in little natural light. In addition, there was potential such a design may encourage moss and mould growing on the concrete. She suggested there were inaccuracies in the diagrams shown by officers. She stressed that the Ms Taylor was not in objection to the application in principle.

Mr Dixon clarified that a three-metre extension could be erected without need for approval, however a six-metre extension required an assessment of neighbouring satisfaction.

Councillor Pettigrew believed that this extension would have a detrimental effect on Ms Taylor's amenity.

Councillor Hasthorpe agreed with Councillor Pettigrew's comments and moved that this application be refused on the grounds of lack of amenity to neighbouring properties. Councillor Silvester seconded his motion of refusal.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as the proposed development was contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018) in that the extension would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the adjacent neighbour by virtue of adverse massing, dominance, and loss of light.

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

Item Five - DM/0897/20/FUL - 18 Oak Road, Healing, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought permission to demolish the existing rear extension and erect a two-storey extension to the rear, creation of living accommodation at second floor level of the existing dwelling, and erect a single storey garage in the rear garden. The existing extension had already been demolished. The materials used for both the extensions and the outbuilding would match that of the existing dwelling, rendered with brick detailed walls, tiled roof and PVC windows and doors. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following objections received from residents and Healing Parish Council.

He explained that the works sat to the rear of the property so the view from Fords Avenue and The Avenue would be limited. It wasn't considered to be unusual to extent to the rear for two storeys. The application wasn't considered to have an undue effect to the character of the street scene. Objections were received siting issues of massing, light, and tunnelling. Light tests had been carried out along with visits to the site, and the neighbouring site. Officers concluded that as the extension lined up with the single storey element next door, it wasn't considered to have an undue impact to the outside or inside amenity area of the neighbour. Objections were received in relation to the Party Wall Act 1996; however, this didn't form part of planning consideration. Mr Dixon confirmed that the application was recommended for approval.

Ms Lilley was invited to address the committee in objection to this proposal. Photos were shown to the committee displaying the site from Ms Lilley's property. She explained that she wasn't opposed to the extending of property in principle, and had made unsuccessful effort to communicate with the applicants on numerous occasions. She feared that the reason for the lack of dialogue was that the applicants were aware of the issues Ms Lilley was going to raise, these included how drastic effect the light reduction, massing, tunnelling, and over shadowing would be to her property. If the first-floor plans were amended to a style to mitigate these effects, her objections would be satisfied. She found it difficult to see how planning officers had recommended this application for approval when considering the light study, solar study, and plans. She questioned the accuracy measurements of the latest plan, which displayed a 45-degree angle starting in a completely different position than that on the original plan. The reason given for this was that the original wasn't accurate so needed to be redrawn. Because of this mistake, and questionable measurements, she was concerned with the overall accuracy of the drawings. This concern was exacerbated by the late-stage realisation of this issue. She felt the amended version of the light study showed only the most favourable elevation view and had omitted the plan view which, she considered, to display the full extent of

the loss of light to a bedroom in her property. Despite her concern with the accuracy of the plans she still felt they represented an unreasonable loss of light to her home. The solar study showed that by 4.00 p.m., throughout the year, the bedroom would sit in shadow for a significant period of time. Currently, the room received sunlight from midday to early evening. She stated that the property would be losing more than half the amount of sunlight it currently received, which would also result in diminished natural heat from the sun. She considered that that 45 degree angle was included to make the extension fit, unduly in favour of the applicants. She disagreed with officers' assessment that the build would be in keeping with the street scene, noting that all houses in the area are of the same period style and proportion. She was without doubt that the proposal was excessively large and, against her property, would look out of place. Again, she disagreed with officers that this would all be an acceptable level. The solar study and full light tests, she felt, would also disagree. The garage and its proximity to Ms Lilley's property was of no concern to her. However, she did have reservations that the original plan showed the proposed building overhanging her boundary. She initially believed that the second light test was to address the change in build location. She was surprised when officers informed her that it was to amend the previously incorrect 45-degree angle. Because of the changes to plans and measurement, Ms Lilley was unsure as to the boundaries of the build. She felt that officers were showing unfair preference to this development. She noted Healing Parish Council's support of her objections.

Mr Dixon clarified that the 45-degree angle was amended on the plans to ensure its accuracy.

Councillor Hudson speculated that the neighbouring house had also been previously extended, however in a more sympathetic way to adjacent residents. He suggested this application could have been designed in a way to considered the impact on neighbours more understandingly.

Councillor Hasthorpe agreed with Councillor Hudson's comments and moved that it be refused on the grounds of lack of amenity to neighbouring properties. Councillor Pettigrew seconded his motion of refusal.

Councillor Parkinson suggested a site visit may help to contextualise the impact to neighbours. Councillor Silvester agreed with his comments, adding that a site visit would offer much more insights into the extent of the impact of this application. Mr Dixon clarified that any site visits that were to take place, would happen virtually because of current restrictions.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as the proposed development was contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire

Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018) in that the extension would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the adjacent neighbour by virtue of adverse massing, dominance, and loss of light.

(Note - the committee voted nine in favour of this application being refused with one abstention)

Councillor Pettigrew left the meeting at this point.

Item Six - DM/0881/20/FUL - Caravan at The Shepherds Purse, Bradley Road, Bradley

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought permission for the continued siting of static caravan accommodation on site for a further temporary period of three years to provide living accommodation. The proposal included two separate static caravans, both of which appear to be self-contained with bedroom, living room, bathroom, and kitchen facilities. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before as the applicant was a North East Lincolnshire Elected Member, Councillor Shepherd.

He noted the planning history of the site, referencing a similar application submitted in 2015 which was refused and dismissed at appeal. A subsequent application was approved in 2017, however it expired April 2020. The time from its expiration to now had been spent developing this current application although there was an impact from Covid-19 and serious personally family issues. A detailed objection from Bradley Parish Council was received. The location sat within the open countryside, therefore the NELLP 2018 and NPPF restricted new households from approval outside of exceptional circumstances. Whilst the applicant had stressed that this application would support his business, his case relied on information submitted in 2017 which, at that time, officers didn't feel was acceptable or sustainable. Since that time, officers didn't feel anything had materially changed and this site didn't have sufficient capacity. The site was reasonably well separated from neighbours, thus the impact on neighbouring amenity was considered acceptable. Mr Limmer confirmed that because of both, national and local, planning policies concerns surrounding countryside development, this application was recommended for refusal.

Mr Close read out a statement submitted by Mr Shepherd, the applicant of the proposal. The statement read that the continued siting of the caravans on site for a further temporary period of three years to allow residential occupation would support the continued business growth at the site including welfare of animals. Planning permission was granted at the site in April 2017 for the temporary living accommodation in association with the existing small holding. However, due to critical family illness of both the applicant's wife and son, who both worked in the business, it had not been possible to fully expand the business as within the anticipated timescales set out in the original business plan. Also, COVID-19, which resulted in both local and national lockdowns, had

further jeopardized the business growth, and, turnover to reinvest within the business. The original business plan was still relevant, and it still proposed to grow and diversify the business through the production and sale of fruit, vegetables, eggs, and meat through the existing farm shop. In addition, further business investment included the introduction of a crop nursery which would include the erection of further poly-tunnels, the development of a farm shop and a workshop, the construction of livestock sheds, the development of day care accommodation for dogs with grooming services, and the development of a fishing pond with small caravan pitch facility. Whilst he appreciated that further investment was subject to separate planning permissions, unfortunately, Councillor Shepherd's main focus had not been primarily on the business expansion, due to family illness and the site being shut down by COVID-19. However, since the granting of the planning permission for the temporary living accommodation, considerable investment had been undertaken to ensure security of the business, investment in new buildings, and poly tunnels and investment in on site facilities. The site, currently, was closed due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and also, the fact that the applicant's family workforce was deemed to be vulnerable. Therefore, the unfortunate decision had to be taken to close the site temporarily to the public. The aims in general terms had already been achieved, through the investment in new buildings, site layout, The Caravan Club registered site, new stock, increasing the hen holdings, a plan to redesign the shop sales area, and the plan to build further outbuildings. This would give a greater capacity to hold all of the stock within the site, rather than it being spread out at other sites throughout Lincolnshire. Councillor Shepherd's residency on site would ensure acceptable levels of animal welfare were always maintained. The poly tunnels were to be redesigned for increased productivity and would create further planting beds. Pig and sheep sales held steady. It was a concern that Councillor Shepherd had to cease all plant sale activities due to being closed down, but he anticipated this to be ready for spring 2021. Since the caravans had been introduced, along with the installation of CCTV, crime had been significantly reduced on the site. Only one minor burglary had occurred of an outside building in three years since Councillor Shepherd began residing on site. This was in stark contrast to the over 13 serious burglaries prior to residency. For clarification, the second caravan was being used ancillary to the main caravan as overspill sleeping accommodation for the applicant's son. The issues raised by Bradley Parish Council regarding the installation of the septic tank had been undertaken with all the relevant consents from the drainage authorities some seven years ago. Councillor Shepherd felt that there was a clear opportunity to provide a bespoke rural business here, especially in these very challenging times. This would be a benefit to the local community as it was clear under the COVID-19 pandemic, more people are supporting local businesses and buying local produce. NPPF polices promoted economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. To promote a strong rural economy, support should be offered to the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing

buildings and well-designed new buildings and to promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. The business was viable, on a sound financial base, was capable of supporting the current workforce, and did not unfortunately achieve everything set out originally to do due to illness and Covid-19 implications, thus it was requested a further three-year consent to consolidate the applicant's position.

Mr Limmer clarified that no other planning applications were currently being processed in relation to this site. In addition, the planning approval for this application expired in April 2020, only at the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Councillor Parkinson felt officers made a compelling case, however he was prepared to offer a further opportunity to the applicant given his personal circumstances. Although he stressed, the applicant should ensure that this time his business is made viable as a priority. He moved that this application be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe appreciated the applicant's personal circumstances; however, he was concerned that absolutely no progress had been carried out in relation to his business.

Councillor Hudson agreed with Councillor Parkinson's assessment of this proposal, adding that the site wasn't clearly obvious when viewed externally. In addition, he noted that the immediate neighbour offered no objection. He seconded Councillor Parkinson's motion of approval.

Councillor Silvester noted that small businesses should be supported by the local authority in these challenging times.

Councillor Mickleburgh worried the committee were affording the applicant extra leeway because he was known to them as an Elected Member. He added that the application may not have otherwise been looked on as favourably. Councillor Parkinson disagreed with Councillor Mickleburgh, stated that he felt the committee were actually able to divorce themselves from their potential personal biases towards the applicant. He stressed his support was a result of the application's merits. Councillor Mickleburgh stressed he wasn't casting any aspersions to any committee member's ability to take a fair and balanced assessment of applications put before them.

Mr Limmer stressed that this application was solely for living accommodation and didn't directly support the business of the applicant. Adding that the business could still operate regardless of approval.

Councillor Hudson referred to the previous security issues of the site, adding that on site residency would go to mitigate this.

Mr Dixon noted that the previous application resulted in the opinion, from both officers and the planning inspectorate, that the case for onsite

residency wasn't compelling. This application sought now for two residential units, he commented this was highly unusual.

The Chair appreciated the applicants position and was minded to support.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, with the following conditions:

1. The use of the land shall cease and both caravans and any associated ancillary structures/works shall be removed from the site and the land reinstated to agricultural land on or before 6th January 2024.
2. Occupation of the caravans is limited to a person solely or mainly employed, or last employed, in the small holding and business known as 'The Shepherds Purse', or dependants of such a person residing with him or her, or a widow or widower of such person. Furthermore, caravan 'B' shall only be occupied as ancillary accommodation to caravan 'A' and at no time shall be occupied as a separate residential unit.
3. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following plans:
 - 03A - Site location plan and proposed block plan
 - 04A - Proposed floor plans and elevations
4. Within three months of the date of this planning permission full details of the foul water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall then be installed in accordance with the approved details, within two months of the approval.

(Note- the committee voted four to four with one abstention, the application was approved upon the Chair's casting vote.)

Councillor Pettigrew re-joined the meeting at this point.

Item Seven - DM/0854/20/FUL - New Farm, Lopham Lane, Laceby, Grimsby

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought permission for the demolition of two existing agricultural buildings and the erection of a single dwelling with associated garden space and parking facilities on land off Lophams Lane, Laceby. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them as it represented a departure from the NELLP 2018.

He noted the site benefitted from more liberal agricultural permitted development permissions in 2020 for the residential conversion of two

adjacent buildings, previously sited for demolition. Therefore, whilst the applicant already had permission for two dwellings, this current application sought to reduce that to one dwelling. Thus, this application was considered to represent a net planning gain. Side windows of the scheme did open onto cottages to the north of the site, although officers conditioned the first-floor windows to be obscurely glazed therefore they considered this impact to overlooking to be acceptable. In addition, the windows only opened on from stairwell, bathroom, and small bedroom uses. The impact on neighbours was therefore considered acceptable. The reduction in dwellings, from previous permissions, would likely present a betterment to the potential impact to highway amenity and safety. The property was considered to be of good design of modest size, thus was considered to offer acceptable impact to the character of the area. Mr Limmer confirmed this application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved that this application be approved. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded his motion of approval.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with the attached conditions.

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

P.60 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 20th November 2020 to 17th December 2020.

The Chair sought further information on applications reference DM/1143/19/LBC and DM/0212/20/REM. Mr Dixon explained that application reference DM/1143/19/LBC ensured further safeguarding works and application reference DM/1143/19/LBC was an outline development for 400 units with no objections.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.61 PLANNING APPEALS

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

Mr Dixon explained that an appeal was submitted in respect of application reference DM/1100/19/FUL. The appeal for application reference DM/0235/20/FULA was allowed, however application reference DM/0454/20/ADV was dismissed.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.62 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.63 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 12:30 p.m.