



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 28th July 2022

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2nd March 2022 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Harness (in the Chair)
Councillors Batson, Beasant, Croft, Goodwin, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Mickleburgh, Pettigrew, Shreeve (substitute for Parkinson) and Silvester.

Officers in attendance:

- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Property Lawyer)
- Richard Limmer (Major Projects Planner)
- Zoe Campbell (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

There were 5 members of the public present and 1 member of the press.

P.69 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

P.70 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received in respect of any item on the agenda for this meeting.

P.71 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

The committee considered a report from the Executive Director of 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 – 4) be dealt with as set out below and detailed in the attached appendix.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that in relation to Item One DM/0753/21/FUL, there was an email from himself included in the papers, where he used the phrase “you get my vote”. Councillor Hasthorpe stated that this was in reference to his appreciation for the work that had been undertaken on the application and was not referring to which way he would vote on this application. Councillor Hasthorpe explained that he would listen to the debate before making a decision as he always did.

Item One - DM/0753/21/FUL – 2 and 4 Caistor Road, Laceby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought consent to demolish part of buildings to rear, alterations and erect rear single storey extension so as to retain public house at no.2 Caistor Road and for a change of use to form a convenience store at no.4 Caistor Road with canopied entrance to side including associated plant areas, service yards, car park, fencing and other associated works (Amended Plans received 5th January 2022 and Amended Description). Mr Dixon informed committee members that planning officers had worked closely with the architect for this development. He stated that the existing building would be retained but enhanced whilst also keeping the character of the building. Mr Dixon stated that this development would remove work previously done that was not to a high-quality standard. Mr Dixon stated that this development would bring back into use vacant buildings and, through well designed alterations, the development would enhance the immediate conservation area. Mr Dixon informed committee members that Laceby Parish Council had raised concerns about the car park and had stated that it was a public amenity, and an important part of the village and loss of the car park would have a negative impact on the community. Mr Dixon stated that the applicant had agreed with the highways officer to accept a planning condition that allowed the car park to be used by the public for public parking. Mr Dixon stated that the application was therefore in accordance with policies 5, 22, 23, 28, 29 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 and was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Wilkinson spoke as the applicant and stated that he was the Development Manager at Lincolnshire Co-operative. He stated that his company had been around for 160 years, serving the community and their purpose was to improve life within the community. He stated that they work with lots of charities and support good causes. Mr Wilkinson informed committee members that his company had been looking for the right location for this development in Laceby for a while. He stated that it was a difficult development as the site was at the edge of the village centre and it was a vital building to the area. He stated that Lincolnshire

Co-operative had worked with both the planning officers and heritage officers as he saw the importance in keeping the historical character of the building in place whilst also enhancing the building and making the development sustainable. Mr Wilkinson stated that Lincolnshire Co-operative would own the site, develop the site and run the store if they receive planning permission. He also informed committee members that the work undertaken would be done by fifteen to twenty local employees. Mr Wilkinson stated that the development would bring back into use vacant buildings and would enhance the conservation area. He urged members to approve the planning application.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that the applicant was Lincolnshire Co-operative and that they were well respected in the area. He stated that he was happy that some of the historical elements of the building would be kept. Councillor Mickleburgh said that while the existing store might not like the idea of a new store being opened close by, that was not a planning concern. He stated that we live in a capitalist society and was pleased to see that this development would bring back into use a derelict looking building. He stated that he was pleased that the issues around parking had been addressed but would like the issue of the current state of the car park to be looked at. Councillor Mickleburgh moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he had been involved in the negotiations with Laceby Parish Council. He said that they had come up with a really good design for this development and echoed the statements from Councillor Mickleburgh regarding the objections raised by a store close by. He stated that competition can be good, particularly with rising prices. He seconded the application for approval.

Councillor Goodwin queried what the timeframe was for the public house work to be undertaken and asked whether the car park would be updated.

Mr Dixon stated that you can never be hundred percent certain of when the work would be finished but stated that following on from conversations with the developers, he said they were keen to get started. Mr Dixon said that while he believed Lincolnshire Co-operative would look to update the car park, there was no planning condition enforcing that as it was a private car park.

Councillor Hudson stated that this was an exciting development and the investment into the local area was welcome. Councillor Hudson said that he sympathised with existing businesses but recalled that when a similar development happened in the Waltham area, there were no businesses that had to close as a result.

The Chair stated that he had heard that there hadn't been any closures or negative effect from the opening of a similar development in New Waltham.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that regarding the state of the car park, some of the existing space would be used for deliveries and storage. He also stated that alterations would occur as changes were made to the entrance and exit of the car park.

Councillor Shreeve stated that he understood some of the objections raised but said that they were not enough to warrant voting against this application.

RESOLVED – That the application and the attached conditions within the report be approved.

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

Item Two - DM/1196/21/FUL - Land at Orchard Fields Healing

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect one dwelling with associated landscaping, boundary treatments and car parking bay (Amended Plans received 4th February 2022 to alter elevations). Mr Dixon explained that it had been brought to committee following an objection from Healing Parish Council about the size of the area and their belief that the area would best be left as a general amenity space to improve the residential aspects of the site for existing residents. Mr Dixon stated that it was a small-scale development and was appropriate in terms of principle and character. Mr Dixon said that it would not have a significant impact on neighbours. Mr Dixon stated that the application was therefore in accordance with policies 5, 22, and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 and sections 5, 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Taylor spoke as the architect for this development. He stated he had been working with planning officers and between them they had previously developed a lovely residential site of three to four bedroom units with a farmhouse cottage design. He commented that these new proposed two-bedroom units would be a more affordable dwelling and could suit a couple or younger person. He stated they would have a similar density to bungalows on the adjacent site and the external amenities would be similar if not more generous. Mr Taylor stated that he had spoken to all the owners of properties on Orchard Fields and they were happy with the proposals. Mr Taylor stated that the proposal of having two-bedroom units would be a better use of an undeveloped part of the site.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that when he was at the parish council meeting, they voted unanimously against these proposals. He said that there would be a loss of open space and he supported the parish council's view. Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that when he first looked at the application, he thought it seemed straight forward but having heard the views of Councillor Hasthorpe, he now agreed with him that there wasn't much open space. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the motion for the application to be refused.

Councillor Hudson stated that after listening to the planning officers and the developer, he believed the proposal sounded reasonable. Councillor Hudson said that there was no doubt a desire for this type of property. Councillor Hudson stated that he was conflicted as he was also at the parish council meeting, and he knew they objected to this application, but he had now heard from the developer that the neighbours were in support. Councillor Hudson stated he would listen to other members and reserve judgement.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that there were bungalows on Poplar Road and smaller properties on Lindsay Road. He said that there were already quite a lot of properties of this size in the area and queried as to why they were building 250 properties of family home size if there is such a need for smaller properties in the area.

Councillor Croft stated that this was a difficult application to consider as it was a small space and we needed to decide what to do with it. She said that she thought this development would not look right and the area would be better as a green area.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she agreed with Councillor Hudson. She said that there would be people retiring that want to remain living in Healing but want a smaller property. Councillor Goodwin said that if the neighbours were happy with the development, then committee members should be as well.

Councillor Hasthorpe queried as to why if neighbours were happy, had there been no representation submitted from those neighbours.

Mr Dixon clarified to committee members that they were not there to look at need, but instead to look at potential of harm, loss of open space and other issues.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he supported the views of the parish council as they represent the views of the residents of Healing. He stated that there was no point in the parish council if we didn't take their views on board.

The Chair stated that we did take the views of all parish councils on board. He said he would be supporting this application as he believed that if it had been a part of the original development, it would have been accepted.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as the proposal represents an over development of the site resulting in the loss of a

proposed area of open space which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area contrary to policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 – 2032.

(Note - the committee voted 6 to 5 in favour of application being refused.)

Item Three - DM/0365/21/FUL - Humberston Fitties Chalet Park, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought retrospective application for the siting of 50 No fire stations already in-situ (amended locations of stations 5, 6, 15, 16 and 44). Mr Dixon stated that there would be no adverse impact on the character of the area. He stated that there were no grounds to object in terms of design and stated that the fire stations were small. Mr Dixon informed committee members that there had been a justification to have these and he didn't believe there were grounds for refusal. Mr Dixon stated that the application was therefore in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 22 and 39 of the NELLP 2018 and was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Shreeve stated that he represented the ward in which the Humberston Fitties were located. He stated that the fire stations must be red to increase visibility. He said that the objections to these were pointless. Councillor Sheeve stated that the Humberston Fitties was not a caravan park, it was the Fitties and was unique to our area. Councillor Shreeve moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that wherever you live, if there was a fire you need to know what to do and be able to see appropriate items. He stated that safety was the priority. He seconded that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson stated that he didn't think the stations looked bad and argued that we need to prioritise people's safety.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he couldn't object to fire safety items being red. Councillor Mickleburgh supported the comments from Councillor Shreeve about the Humberston Fitties not being a caravan park.

The Chair stated that his only objection was that he thought the advice was that people should not be fighting fire and should instead ring the emergency services. He stated he was happy to support this application as fire safety was important.

RESOLVED – That the application and the attached conditions within the report be approved.

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

Item Four - DM/0541/21/FULA - 258 Humberston Fitties, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect single storey extension to side including new roof, install canopy over part of decking to front and installation of shed to rear. Mr Dixon explained to committee members that there had been concerns raised by the heritage officer and Humberston Village Council as the size of the extension was further than the size in the design guide. He stated that these concerns had led to a reduction being agreed. Mr Dixon informed committee members that similar planning permission was granted back in 2013. Mr Dixon stated that the extension would not affect neighbouring amenities or ecology and would not increase flood risk to the occupiers of neighbours. Mr Dixon stated that the application was therefore in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 39 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Shreeve stated that this was a straightforward application, he thought that planning officers had described the application well and moved for approval.

Councillor Hudson stated that he understood the objection raised by Humberston Village Council but argued that when you refer to a previous decision dated back in 2013, it made it difficult to reject this application. Councillor Hudson seconded the application to be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he agrees with the views expressed by Councillor Hudson.

RESOLVED – That the application and the attached conditions within the report be approved.

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

P.72 PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Resources under delegated powers during the period 20th January to 16th February 2022

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.73 PLANNING APPEALS

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.74 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.75 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The committee discussed issues relating to enforcement and raised several matters for further investigation.

RESOLVED – That the information be noted.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 10.48 a.m.