



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 16th December 2021

PLANNING COMMITTEE

3rd November 2021 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

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

Officers in attendance:

- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Keith Thompson (Solicitor)
- Richard Limmer (Major Projects Planner)
- Bev O'Brien (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)
- Matthew Chaplin (Engie)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Also in attendance:

- Councillor S. Swinburn – Immingham Ward Councillor

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

P.39 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology of absence was received from Councillor Goodwin for this meeting.

P.40 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

P.41 APPLICATION FOR PART OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH 43, HEALING DIVERSION

The committee considered a report from the Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Resources making an Order to divert part of Public Footpath 43 in Healing.

Councillor Mickleburgh proposed the application be approved. This was seconded by Councillor Parkinson.

RESOLVED –

1. That an Order be made for the diversion of part of Public Footpath 43, in accordance with Highways Act 1980
2. That, subject to there being no objections, the Order be confirmed or, in the event of objections which cannot be resolved and withdrawn, for the Order to be referred to the Planning Inspectorate for determination.

P.42 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 – 3) be dealt with as set out below and detailed in the attached appendix.

Item One - DM/0863/21/REM - Land North of Main Road (Plot 8 Kings Chase), Barnoldby le Beck

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought consent for variation of Condition 1 and 2 as granted on DM/1039/18/REM to amend the house type and garage of plot 8. The application sought to modify an earlier approval, which sought two detached dwellings and detached double garages with access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale to be considered. The modifications proposed in this application were of an acceptable scale and nature and did not fundamentally alter the original design concept or create any significant additional impacts to the character of the area or to neighbours. Therefore, the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that it was a shame that having approved an application, the applicant then felt the need to bring another proposal forward that was completely different. However, as he couldn't see any planning issues, he moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hudson stated that if this application was anywhere else, the committee would be saying no, but he couldn't see any planning issues that would warrant it being refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe's comments and he wished they had got it right the first time around. However, he could see no planning objections and seconded the application to be approved.

Councillor Parkinson questioned how close the plots were. Mr Limmer confirmed that there was reasonable distance between them.

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

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

Item Two - DM/1103/17/REM - Land North of Main Road (Plot 5), Barnoldby le Beck

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought consent for variation of Condition 1 pursuant to DM/1103/17/REM to amend the design of plot 5. This application sought to modify an earlier approval, which sought two detached dwellings and detached double garages with access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale to be considered. The modifications proposed in this application were considered to be of an acceptable scale and nature and did not fundamentally alter the original design concept or create any significant additional impacts to the character of the area or to neighbours. It was, therefore, recommended for the application to be approved with the attached conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe reiterated his points from the last application and said it was a shame that he couldn't support the Parish Council, but he didn't see any planning objections. Therefore, he proposed for the application to be approved by the committee. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the application to be approved. He stated that he had the same issues as the previous application.

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

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

Item Three - DM/0895/21/FUL- 5 Sonja Crest, Immingham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to raise the roof height and install a side dormer to create additional accommodation at first floor with various internal and external alterations including roof lights. Mr Dixon stated that there were objections to this planning application from 3 Sonja Crest and 6 Sonja Crest but there had been no objections from the residents of 4 Sonja Crest. The proposal consisted of alterations to an existing property and it was considered that they would not present any detrimental impacts in terms of design and neighbouring amenity. The proposal therefore accorded with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (NELLP) and was recommended for approval with conditions

Ms Laverick Robinson spoke as the agent for the application and split her five minutes with the applicant, Reverend Woadden. Ms Laverick Robinson stated that it was never intended to have a negative impact on the area. They had been through many options to achieve the applicant's ongoing needs. There had been numerous pre application meetings with local planners to try and get to the right conclusion and come to mutual agreement. She explained that there wasn't the option to extend to the rear as there was no back garden space and neither was there any space to the front. They were also in need of more circulation space inside and raising the ridge line would be the least obtrusive of them all. The raise was minimal and would allow the usual head space. They only required the dormer to allow for bathroom space. The roof lights wouldn't overlook and there would be no negative effect with the sun either. Ms Laverick Robinson believed the proposal would be sympathetic and attractive to area. It wouldn't have a negative impact on any neighbours. Reverend Woadden added that he found himself in a predicament, leaving him to have to retire early due to his wife's rapid and onset dementia. She was only 63 and unable to do anything by herself. He was nursing her 24/7 and had searched for nine months for a suitable property to suit her needs and for somewhere they could retire together. Life and COVID made it difficult to leave the vicarage. However, when he viewed this property, he got a good feel for the place and thought it was good enough to go for. However, when he received the keys, he discovered that it needed quite a good amount of money spending on it to be able to look after his wife. The bedrooms were extremely small, and electrics needed configuring. He had served the community for the last 28 years and he was asking the committee to help get their retirement home sorted for the little time left together.

Councillor S. Swinburn spoke as the ward councillor for the application. Councillor Swinburn clarified that he was acting in his role of Ward Councillor for Immingham and was not acting as the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport. Councillor Swinburn was concerned about the impact this planning application would have on residents and the overall appearance of the street. He stated that the application was out of character and while the residents at Number 4 Sonja Crest had not formally objected, they had expressed concerns to him. He argued that the extension was large and would be out of character with the rest of the properties on the street. He understood loss of light was not grounds for refusal but that this would affect Number 3 and Number 6 Sonja Crest. He asked that the Committee looked to refuse the application and for members to consider the residents who had lived there for the last 40 years.

Mr Dixon stated that character change of the property wasn't the issue. He believed that the changes would not make a lot of difference and its change of appearance was not a viable reason for refusal.

Councillor Hudson initially could not see how the application would affect neighbours. However, now that they had heard Number 4 had expressed objections he was thinking differently. However, Number 4 did have a

drive separating it from the property in question. He stated that there would definitely be a change, however, he argued that the property did need modernising. Councillor Hudson added that there were several other dormers in the area, and it was obvious the applicant had looked at several different options. He stated that he was still split with his decision, so he would listen to the debate before he decided.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that it was good to know that the immediate neighbour had objected, but looking at the pictures it seemed that a lot of other properties had already made similar improvements.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he felt the variations of properties was sometimes a good thing. Otherwise, the street scene can be quite tedious. He referred to a previous situation in his own ward where neighbours had complained about radical changes to a property but once the work had been completed no one batted an eyelid. He felt that there was a considerable distance between the houses and expressed how people tend to be frightened of what was going to come. He added that he did not think the changes would be so radical.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that he was not familiar with the area, but he compared it to an area in his ward that had been through the same thing. The house types were very similar, and it had resulted in a lot of roof lifts. He added that it was good to know that the residents at Number 4 had objected.

Councillor Green said that members should be reminded as to why the planning application had been brought forward. She added that the changes requested seemed reasonable for the applicant to be able to look after his wife. The area had received a lot of minor changes and she believed these proposed changes would be minor to the street but major to the applicant and his wife's life.

Councillor Beasant said he had had spent the last few minutes looking at Google Earth and he argued that the street scene was varied with some properties having large dormers. He proposed that the application be approved. He understood the objections from neighbours, particularly because people don't like change, but he felt that this proposal was acceptable.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he had sympathy with the family. Change can be very difficult, but he could not see any planning issues for refusal. He seconded the motion for the application to be approved.

The Chair wondered himself whether this proposal would have an impact on the immediate neighbour, but he came to the conclusion that he did not think it would.

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.43 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 23rd September 2021 to 21st October 2021

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.44 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.45 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.46 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The committee discussed issues relating to enforcement and raised several 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 10.30 a.m.