



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

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3rd March 2021 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Harness (in the Chair)

Councillors Beasant, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Goodwin, James, Mickleburgh, Nichols, Parkinson, Pettigrew and Silvester.

Officers in attendance:

- Jonathan Cadd (Senior Town Planner)
- Rob Close (Scrutiny and Committee Support Officer)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Luke Greaves (Head of Highways and Transport)
- Lara Hattle (Highway and Transport Planner)
- Richard Limmer (Major Projects Planner)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Lawyer Property)

P.71 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received for this meeting.

P.72 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Goodwin declared a personal interest in P.73 - item 1 as an objector was a family member.

Councillors Hasthorpe and Pettigrew declared personal interests in P.73 - item 3. The applicant was a distant relative of Councillor Hasthorpe and Councillor Pettigrew was an Ashby Cum-Fenby Parish Councillor.

Councillor Parkinson declared a prejudicial interest in P.73 - item 4 as he had business interests in the hospitality trade.

The Chair declared a personal interest in P.73 - item 5 as the applicant was known to him.

DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

The committee considered a report from the Executive Director 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 – 7) be dealt with as set out below and detailed in the attached appendix.

Item One - DM/1074/20/FUL - 36 Bargate, Grimsby

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained it was a resubmission of application reference DM/0130/20/FUL, refused by the Planning Committee in June 2020 on highway safety grounds. The application sought to demolish existing outbuildings, erect a single storey rear and side extension to create a new entrance to the side elevation, associated works to form replacement and additional accesses, car parking, landscaping, servicing facilities and various other alterations. The main change to the application physically was a wholly internal alteration to reveal the galleried landing and refurbished stained-glass stairwell window at first floor. The staircase would still be removed in this scheme. Access would be formed from Bargate opposite the existing Abbey Road and Wellowgate junctions. Two exits were proposed to Augusta Street, one for service vehicles and one for customers. He noted that the application was previously refused because of the impact to highways safety. The applicant had suggested a 're-white lining' of Bargate to include two ghost lanes, one on the southern direction of traffic to aid vehicles turning right into the site, and the other for north bound traffic for vehicles to turn right onto Abbey Road. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following a request from a North East Lincolnshire Ward Councillor.

He explained that this application was very similar to the one determined to be unacceptable by Planning Committee in 2020. Officers appreciated that there was public concern that the building had fallen out of use and that this application would address that. Although it was regrettable that part of the structure would be lost with this application, the area lost wasn't considered to be of particular significance. The benefit of retaining the staircase was noted. There were no objections to the scheme on the grounds of heritage, which included impact to the character of the conservation area. There wasn't considered to be any change from the previous application in terms of the impact to town or local centres, thus no significant harm was expected. Concerns were raised by residents, because of the potential for increased noise resulting from the servicing required. Officers had worked with the applicant throughout the process, advice from Environmental Protection officers was that, subject to conditions, residential amenity shouldn't be unduly impacted. The applicant had submitted additional information, including a traffic assessment and road safety audits.

Ms Hattle acknowledged that the applicant had submitted additional documents to address concerns raised by officers on the grounds of highways safety. In addition, the trip generation associated with the development wasn't considered severe when taking into account National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The site sat off Bargate, a main route to the town centre and, as such, was very busy. Bargate was also a main bus route to the town centre. As a result of this, three junction points sat a close proximity to each other, these being Augusta Street, Brighowgate, and Abbey Road. The conflict between these junctions, heavy traffic, and bus and cycle movements created a very congested area at certain times of the day. The applicants were looking to introduce a new access point coming off Bargate, in the form of a new right hand turn lane. The Highways Authority acknowledged that the planning and retail statement previously outlined, showed the applicants had addressed concerns of the pedestrian access arrangements in a previous application. In the latest transport assessment, the applicants had stated that the proposed access arrangements, which included the right hand turn off Bargate, was the preferred option which was settled on after various discussions with highways officers, the commission of an independent road safety assessment, and a stage one road safety assessment submitted during the determination period of the recent planning refusal. The Highways Authority wanted to clarify that this was never its preferred option, and was not supported in road safety terms. In addition, the Highways Authority believed there was insufficient road width to safely accommodate this right-hand lane whilst also maintaining appropriate road width for north and southbound traffic.

Ms Hattle explained that the existing road layout already prevented the flow of traffic once a vehicle was stationary waiting to turn into the side street. Whilst the planning and retail statement stated there was sufficient width, the Highways Authority did not concur. This part of Bargate was particularly busy with it being the main route into the town centre. The road width in this location should be a minimum of 10.5 metres to safely accommodate all traffic together with the proposed right-hand lane. The applicants had tried to demonstrate there was a road width of approximately 9.5 metres, however, the Highways Authority considered this unachievable in this location. In addition to this, the width of Bargate was such that a ridged heavy goods vehicle (HGV) waiting to turn right would either hold traffic up behind it, or would need to straddle the centre line bringing it into oncoming traffic. The Highways Authority also noted that there was only sufficient carriageway width available for one car to pass another stationary vehicle on Bargate without hold ups occurring. Even this was not always possible due to the alignment taken by some vehicles waiting to turn into one of the junctions. Anything larger would lead to congestion and, due to the nature of this road, this was a cause of concern. Whilst delivery vehicles were more likely to operate in the early morning, the schedule for servicings still covered busier times of the later morning, increasing concerns. Multiple smaller vehicles waiting to turn into this site from Bargate, could also cause multiple obstructions. The short length of the right turn lane may increase the risk of nose to tail shunt type collisions heading southbound. The length of

the right-hand lane had capacity for a single vehicle, while this may be appropriate for much of the time, peak periods may increase the risk of multiple vehicles waiting to turn right due to the lack of gaps in the north bound traffic. This increased the risk of clear paths southbound being blocked by right turning vehicles, consequently increasing the risk of nose to tail shunts for southbound traffic as they encounter unexpected stationary traffic in Bargate. The short length of the right-hand turn may increase the length of head on collisions. Abbey Road and Brighowgate were key roads to access the south of the town centre including railway centres and major car parks. There was a risk of conflict between vehicles turning right into these two side roads versus vehicles turning right into the development site, such that a head on collision may occur, or perhaps, more likely at urban speeds, right turning vehicles making a last moment avoiding movement that causes a side swipe type collision with a vehicle travelling in the same direction. Cycles being squeezed with narrow lane widths, may increase the risk of collisions with cyclists. The right turn lane provision would create a narrowing of the head carriage lane in both directions. The close proximity to the site exits may increase the risk of junction related collisions. The proposed site exit to Augusta Street was within 10 metres of the junction with Bargate, at a point where vehicles turning into the side roads would be focused on the immediate hazard of oncoming vehicles on Bargate and may only observe a vehicle waiting to join a queue of traffic on Augusta Street, increasing the risk of collision at this point.

Ms Hattle raised further concerns with respect to any vehicle waiting to turn right from Bargate onto Augusta Street, because of the carpark exits proximity to Bargate. If a queue were to form of more than two vehicle lengths, it could lead to any additional vehicles waiting to leave the car park to straddle the opposing carriageway. The driver of the vehicle turning right from Bargate was more likely to be concentrated on oncoming traffic and assessing gaps between vehicles than perhaps another vehicle overhanging the carriageway on Augusta Street. Accelerating away from the junction could leave that driver unable to react to any obstruction to the highway, again increasing the risk of collision. Within the transport assessment, it was shown that there had been a total of 10 collisions over the 2015–19 period. The transport assessment suggested that this was not unusual, however, the Highways Authority disagreed with this statement, especially as two of the collisions were classed as serious. The applicant had been unable to demonstrate that the proposed development wouldn't have a serious impact on the highway network in this location. The Highways Authority was not content with adding another conflicting junction point in this location. Essentially the provision of a right turn for this proposal was likely to increase the level of collisions at this location. The Highways Authority were of the opinion that the proposal at the right-hand lane would increase the risk of road traffic accidents and would also lead to a severe impact on highways. Acknowledging that the existing building could be brought back into use with the existing access points on Augusta Street being utilised, the Highways Authority noted that for this to happen, it would need to retain its previous use. If the current

application wished to utilise the existing access points as they stood, the Highways Authority would have road safety concerns regarding the relevant vehicular manoeuvres being taken. Augusta Street was not a wide road and often had vehicles parked on both sides, should a service vehicle then try to undertake a relevant manoeuvre to enter and exit the site, it was likely that this wouldn't be achievable. It was noted that the applicant could look to implement a traffic regulation order (TRO) to prevent parking on Augusta Street, but this would need to go through a full consultation process. This could take up to 12 months and would need agreement from all residents in the vicinity of the site, and finally the approval of North East Lincolnshire Council. Should that fail, the site would be unable to operate as intended. Ms Hattle fully endorsed the planning officers' report but for the reasons she raised, the Highways Authority recommended that this application be refused.

Mr Miller was invited to address the committee in his capacity as applicant for this proposal. He explained that this application would deliver a number of benefits to the local community. A door-to-door survey of almost 600 residents found that local people were overwhelmingly supportive of the proposals. In the last application, all matters apart from highways were settled. This application, he felt, improved the car park layout and pedestrian route within the site and, following the feedback at the last committee meeting, the gallery landing and stained glass windows would be refurbished and visible for customers to see above the shop's floor. He noted the Highways Authority accepted that the additional traffic generated from the site would be acceptable, in fact being considered to be very low. A one per cent increase over the existing volumes of traffic was expected on this section on Bargate. The number of accidents recorded in the immediate proximity of the site was 0.6 accidents per annum. This low number of accidents was consistent over the last two decades, including when the Conservative Club was in use. All risks highlighted by the Highways Authority currently existed within the wider highways arrangements, however despite this, the number of accidents that occurred was, he felt, clearly low. The proposed access to the convenience store would be safer than these existing arrangements, as a right turn ghost island would be provided. Resulting lane widths accorded with relevant design guidance and did not have any unacceptable impacts on pedestrians and cyclists. This was confirmed in detail in the transport statement. The proposed arrangements had been subject to an independent stage one road safety audit which confirmed that the arrangements would be safe. The evidence, he believed, didn't support the Highways Authority's assertions and he didn't think they had engaged with their evidence as they were unable to counter it. Because of this, Mr Miller felt that the application as submitted, would not result in unacceptable highways safety impacts, and would accord with all relevant policies. He stressed that he specialised in convenience store developments and had delivered many successfully. In addition, he added that this would only be a small convenience store. He asked the committee to consider the evidence presented to them when determining this application. 15 to 20

jobs were expected to result from this proposal and the investment in the area could be complete by the end of the year.

Councillor Woodward was invited to address the committee in her capacity as a Park Ward councillor. She suggested that the site, a previously attractive building, didn't currently look impressive and needed to be brought back into good use. She noted that the site had been empty for nearly 14 years and it risked rapidly deteriorating, both internally and externally. It sat on a main thoroughfare into the town and, in its current state, didn't create a good impression of the town. The previous application highlighted the committee's concern about the impact to the internal heritage of the building, as she understood, these concerns had been addressed by the developer though the retention of as much original balcony and stained-glass window as possible. Community consultation, which she carried out in the summer of 2020, resulted in an excess of 100 people signing a petition within 24 hours to register their support of the applicant using the site as a convenience store. Residents who lived in and around the residential facility at Eaton Court were extremely supportive, especially those who no longer have the use of a personal vehicle and would have easier access to shopping facilities close by. Since then, Councillor Woodward had carried out further telephone consultation with residents, community groups, and businesses which demonstrated the support for this property being brought back into use. She added St. James School were also supportive of this application, stating it would be good use of the building and an excellent facility for many of their boarders. Other options for renovation to this property, she felt, were limited. She noted the need for more luxury flats or hotels in the area wasn't sufficient, referencing a number of properties converted in close proximity to the site. Referencing officers' concerns about the impact to highways, she suggested none of the reports submitted contained any technical evidence. The most recent letter from the agent, she felt, provided compelling responses to officers' concerns. She referenced a previous meeting she had attended with officers to explore redesigns for the junction of Bargate, Brighowgate, and Abbey Road, with a view to extend the junction by taking away the expanse of paving that existed there. Despite agreement to get back to councillors within a certain period of time, she hadn't received any proposals yet. In conclusion, she reiterated some points made by the agent, those being the restoration of a listed building, improving the appearance of Bargate and the Wellow conservation area, creating a number of employment opportunities, improving neighbourhood shopping facilities, and raising confidence in our communities as we come out of lockdown.

Mr Greaves explained that a one per cent increase in traffic on Bargate, as alluded to by the applicant, would probably still represent 500 to 800 movements a day. A large proportion of which would be a right turning traffic. This, and the limited availability of stacking for cars presented a particular concern to officers. One and a half car lengths, represented in the plans, wouldn't be sufficient to accommodate the resultant amount of stacking. He suggested the uncontrolled right turning facility should be

avoided, adding that evidence was supportive of the danger of uncontrolled right turning. He noted that the junction itself was included in the highways strategy, and was being considered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport.

Councillor Goodwin registered her concern about the impact to highways and couldn't support this application.

Councillor Hasthorpe noted that the site's former use as a Conservative Club, in no way influenced his views. He referenced the previous accidents in the vicinity of this site, adding that this would be exacerbated by this application. He sympathised with the applicant and appreciated them addressing the committee's comments about the interior of the building. However, ultimately, he didn't feel this application was much different to the previously refused application.

Councillor Pettigrew echoed Councillor Hasthorpe's comments, adding that he would be eager to see this building brought back into use. He didn't feel the ghost lanes to be a solution to the highways issues.

Councillor Beasant noted that Bargate took a lot of traffic considering the size of the road. If this application were to be approved, he considered the impact to cyclists to be significant. Although keen to see the building brought back into use, he stressed road safety had to come first.

Councillor Silvester stressed that he felt the residents of Park Ward desperately needed something to be done with this site. He asked to what extent highways officers had worked with the applicant to remedy the issues on this site.

Ms Hattle explained that she felt officers worked closely with the applicant during the first application but didn't feel there was anything further to offer during this application. She reiterated that ultimately, highways officers didn't feel there was a way that this development could be considered acceptable in its current form.

Mr Cadd reminded the committee, that the previously refused application was subject to an ongoing appeal.

Councillor Hudson noted that the site was very busy while being used by the Conservative Club, with no particularly significant effect to safety or noise. He added that the investment offered by the applicant could save a very popular building. He moved that this application be approved. Councillor Silvester seconded his motion of approval.

Councillor Parkinson stated the impact to highways worried him considerably.

Councillor Mickleburgh suggested that since its use as the Conservative Club, traffic had increased significantly.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that road markings didn't always ensure adherence to regulations for motorists.

The committee took a vote to approve this application, however the motion was lost on a vote of two to nine.

Councillor Beasant moved that the application be refused per officers' recommendations. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded his motion.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as the proposed development would result in a severe adverse impact on highway safety, road and pedestrian safety, by reason of conflicting traffic movements in an already complex network of junctions and limited road widths contrary to policies 5 and 36 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2018 (NELLP 2018) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF).

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

Item Two - DM/0589/20/FUL - 6 Deansgrove, Grimsby

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained it sought consent for creation of a two bedroom flat at ground floor and a three bedroom at first floor and within the roof space of the building. Access and parking would be from Deansgrove. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following the number of objections received.

He explained that the site was located within the urban area where new housing was promoted. The original application was for four self-contained flats, however, significant objections were received. Subsequently, officers worked with the applicant to reduce the scheme down to the two flats now before committee. Due to the site's proximity to the town centre, there wasn't a necessity for motor vehicles for access to services. The physical changes to the building were limited, so the impact to the Wellow Conservation area wasn't significant. Comments were still waiting to be received from the Fire Service. Mr Cadd confirmed that the application was recommended to be delegated back to officers for approval, subject to comments from the Fire Service.

The Chair sought confirmation that the covenants fell outside of material planning considerations. Mr Cadd confirmed that these fell with the landowner and, although they ran parallel to planning approval, they didn't override the facility to seek planning permission.

Councillor Hasthorpe applauded the application for working with officers, he moved that this application be delegated to back to officers for final approval. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded his motion for delegation.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions, with decision delegated to officers following further consultation response from the Fire Service and no objections being raised.

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

Item Three - DM/0684/20/FUL - Wentworth House, 4 Church Lane, Stallingborough

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought to erect nine detached houses in the garden space of Wentworth House and number 2 Church Lane, Stallingborough. Four of the proposed dwellings would be located in the front garden of the host property, three in the side and rear garden space and a further two dwellings in the rear garden of number 2 Church Lane. Access to the site was currently taken from Church Lane; this access would be retained and improved. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following the number of objections received.

He noted the objections from neighbours raised issues of the impact to the character of the area, drainage, the need for additional housing, and the impact to neighbouring amenity. Benefitting from planning permission for 17 properties to the north, the site also sat within the main settlement area of Stallingborough. Therefore, it was considered acceptable in principle. The wider area of the site was made up of small cul-de-sac estates, this application would follow that character. In addition, existing trees sat along the northern boundary of the site, which helped to maintain character. The impact to the character of the area was therefore considered acceptable. Officers considered the scheme to be well designed, the additional two plots had been reduced down to dormer bungalows and didn't overlook onto neighbours. Plots five, six and seven were orientated to mitigate any undue loss of privacy. The existing access had improved to facilitate the development. A bin collection point was also proposed to avoid the refuse lorry having to undertake any undue manoeuvres. Highways officers were satisfied with the application as laid out. The scheme had been submitted with a detailed drainage assessment. He suggested an amendment to condition five of the recommendations to seek final calculations from drainage officers to determine the storage capacity within the site. Stallingborough was one of the borough's older settlements, and particularly Church Lane being host to a medieval village. This sat therefore, in context to that, with archaeological work already being carried out in the main part of the site. Some existing trees, which were in poor condition, would be removed. The Tree Officer was content that their removal wasn't undue. A new landscaping scheme was included in officers' recommendations. Areas of the site had the potential for ecological value, these was addressed within officers' recommendations. Mr Limmer confirmed this application was recommended for approval.

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

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

(Note - the committee voted 10 in favour of this application being approved with one abstention.)

Councillor Parkinson left the meeting at this point.

Item Four - DM/0926/20/FUL - The Scratching Post, 38 High Street, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought to erect a covered steel canopy over the existing outdoor raised seating area at the front of the Scratching Post, a drinking establishment at 38 High Street, Cleethorpes. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following a request from a North East Lincolnshire Ward Councillor.

He explained that the applicant cited COVID-19 restrictions as a reason for the application, this would allow further outdoor siting and comfort to customers. Officers didn't feel there would be an undue impact to the wider commercial area of the site. However, the design of the canopy wasn't considered to be appropriate for the host property and the wider row of properties. While officers appreciated the rationale behind the application, the impact to the aesthetic of the area was a concern when looking long term. Mr Dixon confirmed this application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Fryman was invited to address the committee in his capacity as the applicant for this proposal. He explained the business was family run and had been trading for 13 years. The ongoing pandemic had been very challenging for Mr Fryman with restrictions greatly limiting his business. This application would provide extra capacity for 24 customers, resulting in extra hours and employment opportunities for staff. In addition, the canopy would allow the applicant to keep the main doorway open allowing a circulation of fresh air into the building. Although this application came as a result of the pandemic, the extra air circulation of an open front door would, he felt, still appeal to customers. He suggested an outside covered seating area such as this would enhance the approach to Cleethorpes. He referenced the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government's comments about the need for flexible planning to allow businesses to evolve in towns and cities. This application was supported by residents and other local traders. He felt that, if constructed tastefully, the application would complement the improvements already in place in Cleethorpes. He suggested if the committee felt that they would be unable to support the application, that they consider a time limited consent for three years.

Mr Dixon explained that the more permanent a structure was, the more of an issue temporary planning permission was to manage. However, in this instance, as the applicant himself suggested temporary permission, members should take this into account during their consideration. He added that as the issue was from an aesthetic perspective, the planning issue would however remain, albeit for a limited period.

Councillor Hasthorpe commented that he had sympathy for the licensed trade and appreciated the applicant's position, however, he wasn't supportive of it being a permanent structure. He moved that this application be refused.

Councillor Hudson felt that canopies could be attractive and beneficial to the business. Although he was concerned that no examples of what the canopy would look like were submitted. Ultimately, he felt approval for a period of three years most appropriate, adding that if, after three years, the applicant would like to keep the canopy, he'd be able to re-apply for permission with the benefit of a three-year precedent.

Councillor Pettigrew considered that the works would blend in well with the current site and would support the business through restrictions.

Councillor Goodwin was supportive of the application subject to the inclusion of a three-year time limit.

Councillor Hasthorpe withdrew his motion of refusal. Councillor Hudson moved that this application be approved for a temporary period of three years. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded his motion of approval.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with a limited period with the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:
3. The canopy shall be removed, and the outdoor seating area reinstated to its former condition within three years of the commencement of the installation of the canopy (with the date of commencement confirmed to the Local Planning Authority in writing when it occurs) unless, before that date, an extension of the approval period had been granted on a further application by the Local Planning Authority.

(Note - the committee voted 10 in favour of this application being approved with one abstention)

Councillor Parkinson re-joined the meeting at this point.

Having advised the Chair prior, Councillor Goodwin offered her apologies for the rest of the meeting and departed.

Item Five - DM/0081/21/FULA - Wold Rise, Chapel Lane, Ashby Cum Fenby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought permission to carry out alterations and extensions to the existing property on Chapel Lane, Ashby cum Fenby. The applicant wished to erect single storey extensions to the front and side elevations of the property including side facing rooflights, erection of a new garage and alterations to the window, and door openings and render cladding to all elevations. As well as the alterations to the dwelling, the applicant proposed to erect a summer house in the rear garden. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following an objection from neighbours and Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Council.

He explained that the principle of the extension was considered to be acceptable. The works would be single storey and in keeping with the host property. While improving the property, officers didn't feel the application created any undue massing or overlooking. The summerhouse sat at the back of the property, and although within a metre of the boundary, the height was considered to be reasonable and wouldn't be uncommon. He suggested that final detail be sorted for the noise attenuation of the heat pump. He confirmed the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved that this application be approved. Councillor Hudson seconded his motion.

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

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

Item Six - DM/1104/20/FUL - Norman Corner House, Waltham Road, Brigsley

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought the erection of a first-floor extension above an existing garage, a single storey extension to the side and rear to include the installation of roof lights, alterations to the roof, and creation of a new access. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following a request from a North East Lincolnshire Ward Councillor.

He explained that the property was already fairly large, the extension was to lead into the main roof of the existing property and finished with a render similar to that at the moment. The application was considered acceptable in terms of design. Neighbouring comments had been taken

into consideration; however, officers didn't feel there was grounds to refuse this application because of the impact to residential amenity. Highways officers were satisfied with the highways access as proposed. Concerns were raised by residents about the impact to telecommunication lines, however, he confirmed this was a private issue between residents and didn't form part of material planning considerations. Mr Dixon confirmed this application was recommended for approval.

Mr Smith was invited to address the committee in his capacity as the applicant for this proposal. He noted that the site was previously a commercial garage, certain aspects still remained. This proposal would transform the existing garage to a large well proportioned house that would improve the architectural aspects of this area when entering the village from Waltham, with this house being the first property on this border. He felt the proposed development would bring the property in line with the character of the large detached executive properties along both Brigsley Road and Waltham Road. This planning application would have been approved under delegated powers had it not been for the number of objections received, however, he stated that all of the objections were from one source, the friends and relatives of the immediate neighbour. He didn't feel any of the objections made carried material planning weight. The way in which the sun rose and set around Norman Corner House would not affect direct sunlight or cause any shadowing to any adjacent property, this was demonstrated on the concept plan issued with the planning application. He felt residents to the rear of his application would feel so adversely affected by his application if they hadn't had amended their property without permission. He acknowledged that the roads and bends on Norman Corner were hazardous and when reversing out of his property he struggled to see oncoming vehicles. For this reason he wanted to reinstate the second access to his property. He stated that he intended to create the additional access point immediately if planning consent was granted as this would provide a safe pull in for any vehicle off-loading material. The subsidence, as raised as an issue by residents, was to the opposite side of the proposed extension and the underpinning was completed under building regulations, signed off by Cleethorpes Borough Council in 1994. He was confused why Brigsley Parish Council initially supported the application until a fairly small amendment was made.

Councillor Hasthorpe felt that the application would improve the property quite dramatically. He moved that this application be approved. Councillor Hudson seconded Councillor Hasthorpe's motion of approval.

Councillor Pettigrew had some sympathy with the neighbour as he felt this application would create a significant mass. He suggested a site visit may have been beneficial but, due to COVID-19 restrictions, he acknowledged that this wasn't possible. Councillor Parkinson echoed Councillor Pettigrew's comments.

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

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

Item Seven - DM/1044/20/FUL - 6 Brook Lane, (Plot 10) Waltham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought an amendment to the dwelling proposed at plot 10 as granted on application DM/1192/15/FUL, to alter the appearance and orientation of a previously approved dwelling. He showed the committee plans and pictures of the site and explained that it came before them following a request from a North East Lincolnshire Ward Councillor.

He explained that whilst the comments of Waltham Parish Council were acknowledged and there were objections to the scheme because of its departure from the original plan, officers didn't feel the amendment had an undue impact on the character of the development. In addition, he noted that the general character was made up of substantial two storey developments. Mr Dixon confirmed this application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Mickleburgh moved that this application be approved. Councillor Hasthorpe 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.74 PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Executive Director Environment, Economy and Resources under delegated powers during the period 21st January 2021 to 17th February 2021.

The Chair registered his endorsement of application reference DM/0876/20/FUL, considering it a welcome addition to student safety.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.75 PLANNING APPEALS

The committee received a report from the Executive Director Environment, Economy and Resources regarding outstanding planning appeals.

Mr Dixon confirmed that applications reference DM/0679/19/TPO, DM/0130/20/FUL, and DM/0260/20/FUL were still ongoing. On the basis of retail impact, application reference DM/1100/19/FUL was dismissed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.76 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.77 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 12.10 p.m.