



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**14<sup>th</sup> July 2021**

**9.30 a.m.**

### **Present:**

Councillor Harness (in the Chair)

Councillors Beasant, Batson, Croft, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Parkinson and Silvester.

### **Officers in attendance:**

- Richard Limmer (Major Projects Planner)
- Hannah Dixon (Solicitor)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Highway and Transport Planner)
- Bev O'Brien (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)

### **Others in attendance:**

- Councillor Shepherd – Scartho Ward Councillor

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

### **P.10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Pettigrew, Goodwin and Mickleburgh for this meeting.

### **P.11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Harness declared a personal and prejudicial interest in P.12 - Item 1 as the applicant was a family member.

Councillor Parkinson declared a pecuniary interest in P.12 - Item 5 as he owned a similar business close to the one in discussion.

### **P.12 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS**

The committee considered a report from the for 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 – 9) be dealt with as set out below and detailed in the attached appendix.

As Councillor Harness had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 1, it was moved by Councillor Hudson and seconded by Councillor Parkinson that Councillor Hasthorpe chair the meeting in his absence.

Councillor Harness left the meeting

COUNCILLOR HASTHORPE IN THE CHAIR

### **Item One - DM/1084/20/REM - Land At Bradley Road, Barnoldby Le Beck.**

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought consent to erect 66 dwellings and to consider access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. He showed Members pictures and plans of the site and dwellings. It consisted of a mix of detached and semi-detached properties, including 13 affordable units required by the agreed Section 106 Legal Agreement under the outline permission. Mr Limmer explained that this was a reserved matters application in relation to an already approved outline planning permission on an allocated site in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 to 2031 (adopted 2018). The 66 dwellings proposed accords to that number. The details for consideration under this application were acceptable in layout and amenity grounds and in terms of the highway layout. The designs and landscaping detail had been enhanced since the application was deferred at the April Committee and as a result the development was considered to accord with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan, therefore the application was recommended for approval.

Mr Snape introduced himself and spoke as the applicant of this proposal. He explained that he was a partner of Snape properties, which was a family business who employed over 50 local trades and always used local suppliers as they saw it as a small way to support the local economy. They aimed to deliver five houses a year, so he indicated how that showed their commitment make the best houses and not to making money. Mr Snape added how he was disappointed that this application was deferred from the April Committee, but he stated how they had taken comments on board. The design team had worked hard to alleviate concerns and he now believed it had a true reflection on the street scene. There would also be open landscapes and layout. He hoped this application addressed all Members concerns as their intention was to start immediately after the conditions had been discharged. Mr Snape added that if this were to be approved, it would not be beneficial for them to carry forward the appeal process on the last decision and it would be withdrawn.

Councillor Jackson spoke as ward councillor for Waltham. He stated that he was here to speak against the application. One main issue was the street scene. He stated that the last application was deferred to negotiate the types of homes to be included and to make sure the frontage was more in keeping with the existing street scene. He clarified that the deferral was very clear on what needed to take place to make this application acceptable. The landscaping was to run full length. He felt the applicant was playing lip service to what the committee wanted to hear. The second issue was the road safety element. The access to the new development was in the wrong location. It was currently opposite the access to Marion Way. This development gave them the opportunity to put a roundabout in. He wondered why this had not been included. As ward councillor he tended to have a different view to highways officers. It was his ward and he drove along this street every day. He knew the traffic issues they had down this road, a roundabout would reduce the number of right hand turns and he stated that we all knew how dangerous right-hand turns could be. He knew that it may be more expensive, but it would be a major road improvement. Councillor Jackson hoped the committee decided to defer this proposal again for further consideration.

Councillor Hudson supported the deferral last time as he thought a roundabout would be a good idea. However, highways had now said they were not happy to support it. If a roundabout were to go ahead it would mean a reduction in the speed limit. He stated that it was already an approved site. If Committee were to say no, he explained how the appeal submitted was for an application with more dwellings. He wondered whether it would be a disservice to the residents if 82 were to get passed because they refused this on the ground of not implementing a roundabout. He stated that they needed their planning hats on. The site was acceptable. A buffer zone was to be included and it would stop any further development. He stated how he supported the deferral before, but he did not think the committee could keep on deferring. He would reserve judgement until he had heard other members views.

Councillor Beasant stated that last time he moved for the deferral and he welcomed the news of the developers' improvements. He believed the site had improved greatly. He stated that they made the right decision to defer as the application had come back as something that was a lot more appealing. The visuals and the presentation of the dwellings was a lot better. He gave credit to the developer for their hard work. He wondered how many times we could defer until members thought it to be acceptable. If it were to go back to original application the appeal could win and we would end up with more houses, which he would be against. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Parkinson stated that it was a site that not many people wanted to see get built on. However, it was allocated within the Local Plan. Deferring this application once was acceptable but to do it again would be bad. He wished that the entrance had been changed but it may mean that it would end up being a blackspot in the future. The original idea for deferral was to stop it looking like an estate. However, he thought the

frontage still looked like an estate. Councillor Parkinson asked how many house types there were, and he wondered how sure Officers were that the drainage plans were up to scratch.

Mr Limmer explained that there were eleven different house types. Some were not different but just mirrored. He added that condition four referred to foul water drainage and asked that plans would need to be submitted and agreed. However, there had been no objections to this from Anglian Water, therefore Officers believed the content was acceptable.

Councillor Hudson asked for clarification whether the picture submitted via the supplementary papers, showing a blocked toilet was due to issues from this site and he asked that highways officers explain why having a roundabout was not a good idea.

Ms Hattle explained that the access the applicant put forward was acceptable. She explained that the Highway Authority would not look to support a mini roundabout for new developments as they were shown not to work correctly. She also reiterated that the proposals put forward did not include a mini roundabout and the access shown on the plans was considered acceptable for the development.

Mr Dixon added again that Anglian Water had not raised any concerns. As the site already had outline planning permission, it meant that consideration had been given to all 66 dwellings being connected to the water system and still Anglian Water showed no concerns.

Councillor Hudson stated that after hearing the answers to his questions he was happy to second the application to be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe did not think this had been reconsidered enough. It would have been better if a lower roofed building had been located at the front to help with street scene. He would have liked to have seen a change from original plans. Dormer and one level bungalows would have been a lot nicer from the street scene. He stated that the Section 106 did not benefit Barnoldby le Beck. He explained how a sum of money would have been very beneficial to Barnoldby Le Beck.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions listed within the attached appendix.

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

Councillor Harness re-entered the meeting at this point.

COUNCILLOR HARNESS IN THE CHAIR

## **Item Two - DM/1038/20/FUL - Healing Village Hall, Great Coates Road, Healing.**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it was deferred at the last Planning Committee meeting to allow further negotiations to take place with respect to the access gate and vehicles overhanging the highway. This has led to a proposal for an electric gate which could be opened before staff arrived at the entrance reducing the possibility of vehicles having to wait on the highway for access. He showed Members pictures and plans of the site. The use of the premises as a member only retail use was not deemed to harm community facilities within Healing as an enhanced facility elsewhere in the village had permission and work was scheduled to start in July. In the intervening period the hall would be rented back by the parish to allow activities to continue. The development, however, would be in a busy and congested location, close to the entrance to Healing Academy where children arrive and leave in large numbers. In highway terms there were significant concerns with safety and capacity. Vehicles turning into and out of the site at these times could detract from safety and weigh against the proposal in any planning balance. The applicant had, however, provided details based on existing operations that vehicle movements would not be high, that vehicles could turn within the site, parking space numbers would be sufficient, and servicing could also be undertaken within the site. This together with conditions limiting net retail floor area and the use would be sufficient to limit activity to acceptable levels that allowed a recommendation for the application to be granted.

Mr Marriott spoke as the agent for this planning application. Following the site meeting with officers, the applicant was content with changes mentioned in the introduction to this proposal. He stated that moving the gate onto the site was not practical and it was agreed that a remote automation gate was the best way to make sure no obstruction happened. It was to be a fast-opening system and it had transponders to make sure it did not close when there were vehicles or people in the way. A code would be provided if an emergency were to take place. It was a club for church members only. Traffic movement would be low and there would be restriction to deliveries, which would always be received by a member of the team on site.

Councillor Hasthorpe thanked the applicant for listening and acting on councillors' concerns. It had allayed any fears he had and he moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hudson stated that he was happy to pass as it was. However, he thanked Councillor Hasthorpe for drawing their attention to it as it was a far better scheme. He seconded the application to be approved.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he did not see there being any traffic issues.

RESOLVED –That the application be approved, subject to the conditions within the attached appendix.

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

### **Item Three - DM/0426/21/FUL - 74 Stallingborough Road, Healing.**

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought to erect single storey rear extension with roof lights to existing garage to form pool room, retain play equipment to rear of garden, erect porch to front elevation and alterations to boundary treatments to include installation of gate. He explained that the principle of this proposal was deemed acceptable, and the comments received did not seem to have objection towards the front boundary treatment and extension; it was more around the play equipment at the rear. Nevertheless, the mitigation measures put in for the play equipment reduced the impact on the neighbouring properties to an acceptable level. The other elements proposed were considered acceptable. The application was therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the NELLP 2018 and was recommended for approval.

Ms Carole Harrison spoke as an objector towards the application. She explained that she lived in the property directly behind the proposed property. She stated that they moved to Healing to be close to her parents due to poor health. It was a new build bungalow and a large park area appeared in their neighbour's garden without any planning permission being received. She stated that they had a garden that was big, but they still decided to have it where it would be closest to their property. Ms Harrison said that their living area was all on the back of their house. They had a lattice fence on top of their original fencing, but it still allowed anyone using the play equipment to tower over and see directly into their home. They currently had no privacy. They had to contact planning and when officers visited, they stated it was not acceptable. As punishment, their neighbour moved the trampoline closer to the fence. This added to the upset. The household retrospectively put planning permission in. Objection was supported by Healing Parish Council, but they had now amended their plans and put in to include a hedge and roofs on the play equipment. However, she believed this would give them more of a vantage point to climb on roofs. No one would like this to happen to them. They had grandchildren but the lack of privacy was unacceptable.

Mr Dieter Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He explained that the application had only been objected to by the parish council and one single resident. Three of the application requests raised no objection. The one issue raised led to concerns being mitigated and plans being updated. The main concern was the proposed location of play equipment. He explained that to mitigate the concerns, the central platform would be flipped over to be more in the main garden, away from the neighbour in

question. There was an existing high boarded fence that was erected by the neighbour and the platform was only 1.5 metre high. The applicant had offered to plant a hedge for additional screening. Mr Nelson stated that all these mitigation methods should prevent any impact on to the neighbours of Acorn Close.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he was a resident of Healing and it was also the Ward he represented. He thought the play equipment was ugly. He could not think of anything worse being next to his home. It was far to close and far too big. He recommended for the application to be refused due to the impact the play equipment would have on the area and the loss of privacy to close-by neighbours.

Councillor Hudson stated that he had no issues with most of the changes to the dwelling. However, the play equipment amendments were worse than what it was now. It was a huge garden and they had chosen to put it as far away from their own house as possible. He second the proposal to refuse.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he could not support the play equipment.

Councillor Silvester asked if Committee could just make it a condition for the play equipment to be moved.

Mr Dixon stated that the proposal had to be considered as it was stated within the application, they could not pick and choose elements.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be refused as the development was unacceptable due to the siting and design of the play equipment which resulted in an adverse loss of privacy and disturbance to neighbouring property to the detriment of residential amenity contrary to Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

(Note - the committee voted six to two in favour of this application being refused.)

#### **Item Four - DM/0350/21/FUL - Valley Cottage, Hatcliffe Road West, Ravendale.**

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought to demolish an existing dwelling, erect a new dwelling with a detached garage, a detached barn / stables block with boundary treatments, access, landscaping and boundary ditches. Whilst it was noted that the application had attracted a large number of comments, both in support and against the development, it was considered to accord with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (NELLP) and the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This was in specific regard to the impact on neighbours, the character of the area and Area of Natural Beauty (AONB) and drainage and flood risk. It was therefore recommended that the application be approved.

Due to an objector not being able to be present, the Chair agreed for Mrs O'Brien to read out the statement Mr Tom Haxby had prepared:

As the next-door neighbour and a farmer of over 50 years in Ravendale Valley, he reiterated that the proposed development should be of an appropriate scale, mass and design that recognised the landscape character and natural beauty of an AONB. He would not object to the dwelling, even though the development was considerably bigger than the current dwelling along with the garage block. However, he did not agree to the brick stable blocks with its own access from the road as this would be converted in later years to a dwelling which had a bigger footprint than the house and garage proposed. Crossways, East Ravendale, applied for planning for a stable block in the very same grass field. The application was rejected as it was a building in a green field site. They were granted permission for a stable block as long as it was kept in the curtilage of the house and garden. The proposed large stable block would be built on 4 acres of grassland with the planting of trees; how could this support five horses. Members had to take into consideration land type and weather patterns. The soil was clay loam, which meant the water drained slowly. The last two winters had been very wet and this meant the proposed stocking density, the field in the winter would resemble a ploughed field. If the stables were passed, he felt it would be a travesty for the Lincolnshire Wolds because it would provide an opportunity for anyone who owned the land to get easy access to planning. They could sow grass and plant a few trees on 4 acres, then erect a large brick stable block with good road access. This could be left for 5 years, with maybe 1 horse put in the stable block initially, and then let it get run down. There could then be an application for change of use to residential. He felt this sounded like a pretty good business plan. He understood that there was going to be a shed for machinery on this site, he wondered if this would be for the owner's helicopter. Regular helicopter flying in this area was not very good when there were so many horses, cyclists and walkers around. There were also concerns from next door neighbours of the use of helicopters on this land currently as it frightened their own horses.

Mr Haxby added that he put in a pre-planning application for agricultural sheds in the next-door field, which would have employed workers, but it was going to be turned down as it could be seen from the Wanderlust Way footpath. The proposed buildings would be seen from the Wanderlust Way footpath and were very close to the road. Surely this would have a detrimental effect on the landscape for both walkers and cyclists. Over recent years, there had been a number of trees taken down without proper authorisation. All the scrub areas had been cleared; this had destroyed the wildlife habitats that were present. There seemed to be no respect to living with nature. The wood used to be a thriving rookery, not anymore, especially since it used to be used as a wood yard for his brother who was a tree surgeon. The house expansion was only possible because of the trees that were cut down. On the opposite side of the road, the land was owned by the same owner. When it was purchased, the land was all scrubbed out, again without

planning permission and once again no regard to the environment. Ravendale was a unique area, and an AONB in North East Lincolnshire and we need to protect the area from too many dwellings and from destroying wildlife. If this development went ahead then landowners nearby would use this as a precedent for future proposals within the area.

Mr Aidan Jones spoke as the applicant and owner of Valley Cottage. He explained that he had lived and worked in Ravendale for all of his life. Ravendale was a perfect place to raise children. Neither himself nor his partner grew up with money, but they had worked hard to get to the position they were now in. They had worked hard to promote the business. Valley Cottage was purchased several years ago and they had recently sold their family home in Cabourne, which they spent years restoring. They were very aware of the importance of the AONB. He stated that they had purchased various pieces of land close by, when they became available. There was a paddock opposite the bridal path, a 1.5-acre pond. The previous owner had the dwelling for 20 years and with a bit of labour of love it would be brought back to life. It was a well-stocked pond with different types of wildlife. They had worked with planners to build a well looking farmhouse. A lot in the area were of the same size and scale. They had looked at how they could enhance the area and how it would give back in years to come. The once arable farmland would come back to life. Adding more woodland planting would create a stunning and beautiful backdrop. He stated that the stables could potentially change back to a residential dwelling but, if approved, conditions would be put in place and that would never be able to happen. Planners guided them to use brick as it was more in keeping with the area and they were happy to fully support their suggestions of materials as they would be more sustainable. It would be their first and last new build. He hoped Members could share their vision.

Councillor Hudson stated that this was not the first time the applicant had applied for planning permission on this site. As soon as it was granted the site was put up for sale. He knew the site well. He watched with dismay the loss of trees over the years. It led to the garden of valley cottage which encroached into woodland. The proposal would not fit with the original scale. His concerns were that it would be detrimental on the street scene as it was a unique part of the Wolds. The AONB had a lot of visitors from walkers and cyclists etc. He was taught that an AONB needed to be built on in exceptional circumstances. He believed they had to stick to rules. The countryside needed to be preserved. It was always a shame when a small cottage had to be knocked down. He wondered whether this was the right location for something of this scale. A stable block in open countryside would be seen from Wanderlust Way. He moved for the application to be refused, but he wanted to work with applicant to see what was best for the land and what would satisfy objections raised.

Councillor Hasthorpe agreed with what Councillor Hudson has said. It was alongside a beautiful road and it was unacceptable to put this in the middle

of a green field. He believed it would be over intensification of the plot. He seconded the motion for the application to be refused.

Councillor Beasant stated that he was not sure about some aspects of this application until Councillor Hudson spoke. He did not know the area well. However, he had cycled through there a couple of times. He was concerned about the number of trees potentially being removed. He would have liked to have seen better photos of the cottage as it was now.

Councillor Harness wondered about the stable block exception test. Mr Limmer explained that it was not a formal exception test. It was to see whether it be compatible with the open countryside. Mr Limmer went on to clear up a few other points. He stated that in planning terms, the use of stables and equine use had to be in an open countryside location. The planting proposed would compensate the loss of trees as there was a good amount to be added.

Councillor Hudson believed that to be able to accept a dwelling in open countryside it had to be suitable. The location they were looking at was the most open countryside you could get in an ANOB.

Councillor Parkinson stated that, as mentioned, it would be clay soil which was not very good for horses in the winter. He went for a drive to see the site and he stated that it was very waterlogged. There was no justification for the stable when horses would not be able to graze in the winter. He believed the house, while big and obtrusive, was acceptable.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as the proposed development, by reason of its size, scale, design and position, would result in an adverse visual intrusion detrimental to the rural character of the area and wider Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This was contrary to Policies 5, 22 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018) and Sections 5, 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

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

Councillor Parkinson left the meeting at this point.

### **Item Five - DM/0528/21/FUL - Tale of Two, 2 - 3 Alexandra Road, Cleethorpes.**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought permission to erect a single storey front extension. It was a well-used seating area that provided views over the promenade. He showed members plans and pictures of the proposal. He added that the proposed glazed extension would provide an additional area of enclosed space which could be used fully in all seasons, not just in summer. This would assist to grow this business but also the local economy which weighed in favour of the proposal. Similarly, due to the current use of the patio the

impact on neighbours, in terms of noise and nuisance, subject to conditions, would be acceptable. However, it was located within a prominent and key part of the Central Cleethorpes Conservation Area, which was presently deemed by Historic England as at risk through the loss of historic and traditional building features and was subject of a Heritage Lottery Grant to replace these features to enhance the traditional high quality character to the area. The proposed extension would completely obscure the buildings original frontage with its traditional character features. Given the importance of heritage in this key part of Cleethorpes, the detrimental impact on the appearance of the building and the character of the conservation area was deemed to outweigh the benefits. Therefore, it was recommended for refusal.

Mr Lince spoke as the applicant for this proposal. He indicated how hospitality had been through an unprecedented 18 months. The pandemic was far from over and he believed they had to learn to live with COVID. These were frightening and uncertain times. Looking at the future and how they could protect themselves, he believed that a space that was COVID secure and well ventilated would be their saviour. He explained that they tried to create a light profile unit that would allow people to still enjoy the view. 95% of it was glass and they had tried to build the character of the area into the design. As a business they had struggled financially, as they have had to accept grants and loans, they were in the greatest debt they have ever had, and their future was worrying. If the proposal were approved, it would help secure their future, keep staff employed and return their remaining staff from furlough. It would be a unique space and would be useable all year round. He reiterated how it would secure the future employment of their staff and hopefully attract new and old customers.

Councillor Hasthorpe said how it was great to see the RAF club being brought back into the state that it should have been in for many years. In the whole, North East Lincolnshire had seen so many fine buildings disappear. Now they were coming back into use. He believed this flied in the face of every aspect of that. He thought the proposal was ugly. Yes, it had been a terrible time in terms of the hospitality business, but every time he drove past, the outside area was always full, so it didn't mean people didn't sit out there. He moved for the application to be refused.

Councillor Hudson stated that his heart wanted to say yes as he had sympathy for the applicant and he could see what he was trying to do, but he just could not agree with it. He seconded the motion to refuse.

Councillor Harness sympathised with applicant, but there had recently been a lot invested in Cleethorpes so, if approved, it would be a disservice to the work done.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be refused as the proposed extension represented a large, prominent, and incongruent design which would be detrimental to the traditional and quality appearance of the building and that of the Central Cleethorpes Conservation Area in which it was located. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies: 5, 22, 23

and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (adopted 2018) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework including paragraphs 66 and 72.

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

Councillor Parkinson re-entered the meeting at this point.

### **Item Six - DM/0513/21/FUL - Land Adj Field Gates Post Office Lane, Ashby Cum Fenby.**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought temporary siting of a static caravan for a period of 18 months during the build phase for the new dwelling on site. As the proposal was for a temporary period in relation to the construction of the dwelling, the caravan was considered acceptable. There would be minimal impact to the character of the area and residential amenity and ecological issues had been addressed. Therefore, the application was recommended for approval.

Mr Dieter Nelson spoke as the agent for the proposed application. He believed there had been a misunderstanding and he wanted to provide clarity. The revised plan included a foul and water system from the caravan. The static caravan and container were to be temporarily sited to the north of the plot. It was for a duration of just 8 weeks to allow a mitigation survey to take place. There would be no-one living in it. The new fence would remain in place and, following the new survey, they had agreed with the ecologist that a live connection would be made to the adjacent ditch. He hoped members would agree with the officers recommendation and approve this application.

Councillor Jackson spoke as Ward Councillor in objection to this application. He reminded members that it was illegal to build on land where great crested newts may live without a request for a licence and an ecological survey being taken. He added that it was illegal by putting anything on the site in the first place. A couple of months ago, members were minded to refuse the caravan and on the latest plan it had moved to a slightly different location. It would provide the same issues they had before. It was an illegal siting of a caravan and there was potential damage to protect different species and minimise site disturbance. Having someone live on site wouldn't achieve the end of minimisation of disturbance, it was not unusual or inappropriate to live on site during construction but in this case, there was no need for it to happen. Members needed to err on the side of caution to protect great crested newts. He asked Members to support the objection of the parish council. He was appalled how the applicant was behaving on the site. The report stated that no neighbour objected, but he asked Members not to read much into it as neighbours know they would have to live with the consequences if the applicant saw that they had formally objected. There was a lot of concern within the village if this was to be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe wondered how many more applications could be submitted for one site. He recommended that the application be refused.

Councillor Hudson initially thought that this application was straight forward. Officers assured the committee that there were no issues. However, Councillor Jackson had shown how detrimental someone living on the site could be. He was at a loss and would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Parkinson stated that the ecology officer seemed happy with the proposal. He was not sure that they had grounds to refuse.

Mr Dixon added that there had been several meetings with the Northern Powergrid and issues had been mitigated. An ecologist had also visited the site and was happy with the mitigation put forward. Experts in this field were telling officers that the proposal was acceptable. Members needed to be mindful that they had been told by experts that there were no issues related to this site. Planning permission had already been given for a dwelling to be built here so mitigation in terms of ecology would already be in place for that.

The Chair asked if there were any Members who wanted to second Councillor Hasthorpe's motion to refuse. No one indicated. The motion fell.

Councillor Hudson stated that all the issues he had with the last application had been mitigated and he could not see how they could refuse again. He moved for the application to be approved. Councillor Batson seconded this.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions included within the attached appendix.

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

## **Item Seven - DM/0180/21/FUL - Astle BMW Grimsby Road, Laceby.**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought to erect a BMW motorcycle showroom building and standalone wash/valet building along with elevation changes to existing showroom/workshop building. The proposed showroom building was to create a separate showroom for the motorcycling business. This building proposed, as well as the new wash/valeting building and alterations to the existing building on site, were of a reasonable scale, size and appearance and would not lead to any undue impacts on the appearance and character of the area. There were no changes proposed to the access and egress arrangements to and from the site. The issue in relation to deliveries had been addressed. Therefore, the application was considered to comply with Policies 5 and 22 of the NELLP 2013 to 2032 (adopted 2018) and was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe was delighted that the suggestion he made had been adhered to and it had been negotiated to a conclusion. His only worry was whether transport lorries were able to exit the site safely. Mr Dixon stated that as part of protocol it had been confirmed that cars would be moved so that the transporter could leave the site easily.

Councillor Hasthorpe recommended approval. Councillor Hudson seconded this.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions stated in the attached appendix.

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

## **Item Eight - DM/0381/17/FUL - Garages Granville Street, Grimsby.**

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought to demolish existing garages and workshop, erect nine dwellings with associated parking, landscaping and alterations to vehicular and pedestrian access. This proposal related to the erection of nine dwellings with associated works on land at Granville Street in Grimsby resulting in the redevelopment of a brownfield site providing housing. The proposal would not present any significant impacts in terms of its design and there would be no significant impact in terms of residential amenity, highways, drainage or ecology. The application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe recommended for the proposal to be approved.

Councillor Parkinson believed the design had been done well. He seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Beasant was happy to support the application, but he wondered how the designer was able to fit all these houses within such a small location.

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

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

### **Item Nine - DM/0175/21/FUL - Salisbury Court, Barnoldby Road, Waltham.**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought retrospective permission to erect a single storey timber staff room and a single storey extension to the existing nursery to provide an additional classroom. It was considered to be achievable without harm to the character of the area and street scene and it would not give rise to significant impacts in terms of residential amenity or drainage. Matters in relation to the public rights of way had been resolved. Subject to conditions, it was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe recommended the application for approval. Councillor Hudson seconded this.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions stated within the attached appendix.

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

## **P.13 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 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2021 to 1st July 2021.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

## **P.14 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.15 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.16 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.