



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 17th March 2022

PLANNING COMMITTEE

5th January 2022 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

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

Officers in attendance:

- Lara Hattle (Highways and Transport Planner)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Property Lawyer)
- Richard Limmer (Major Projects Planner)
- Bev O'Brien (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Jackson (Waltham Ward Councillor)

There were 11 members of the public present at the meeting and 1 member of the press.

P.55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence for this meeting.

P.56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair on behalf of all committee members declared a personal interest in P.57 Item 2 as the applicant is an elected member of North East Lincolnshire Council.

P.57 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 – 5) be dealt with as set out below and detailed in the attached appendix.

Item One - DM/1112/21/FUL– 18 Lytham Drive, Waltham

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought consent to erect an extension to the front to include first floor rooms in the roof space and to erect a single storey store extension to side, converting the existing roof space. The application also sought consent to install a dormer to the side with alterations to an existing detached bungalow. Mr Limmer stated that there had been objections to the application being approved from neighbours and Waltham Parish Council. However, he stated that the proposed development would not cause undue harm to the appearance of the street scene, the wider character of the area or neighbours residential amenities. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 – 2032 (NELLP) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mrs Johnson spoke as an objector to the application and stressed that she was not only concerned about the planned dormer but also concerned about the impact the front extension would have on her life and wellbeing. Mrs Johnson stated that she was also concerned that the overall build would have a damaging effect on the street scene. Mrs Johnson argued that the front 3.2 metre extension would be unusually close to the boundary and would overshadow and block her ground floor sitting room window resulting in a visually intrusive and overbearing boxed in feeling. Mrs Johnson argued that the dormer had only been slightly redesigned to include an odd shape at the side but the overall width remained the same. She argued that it would overlook and overshadow her private back garden by 2.2 metres. Mrs Johnson pointed out that the existing dormers in Lytham Drive were smaller and posed no threat to sunlight, daylight or residential amenities. Mrs Johnson also disagreed with officers that it was not unusual to see a development of this nature in Lytham Drive. Mrs Johnson noted that number 18 would be the only 4 bedroom property in the near area, with an extended ground floor front, extended loft conversion, dormer extension and side extension. Mrs Johnson referred to their being fewer comments from neighbours objecting to the application and stated that she believed the applicant visited these objectors, and within days of the previous application being refused, the applicant erected a 2 metre fence without consultation and plants in her garden were chopped down without her consent. Mrs Johnson further expressed that there were no changes to the previous application regarding extensions to the front of the property and as the dormer would still be highly visible from the street, she didn't see that this justified the Committee changing their views. She asked the Committee to take into account her views and the views of the parish council, ward councillor, civic society and other neighbours.

Mr Blair spoke as the applicant and stated that he had designed his extension specifically to have limited impact on the street scene. He argued that the front extension would have no impact on the street scene and the side extension would only have a limited impact on the street scene. Mr Blair also stated that the dormer would be hidden from view and the size of the dormer had been reduced from the initial proposed size in his previous application. Mr Blair stated that out of courtesy, he had presented his plans for the extensions to his neighbours.

Councillor Jackson spoke in objection to the application. Councillor Jackson clarified that he was acting in his role of Ward Councillor for Waltham and was not acting in his role of Leader of the Council. Councillor Jackson stated that he spoke in objection to the previous application submitted by this address but clarified that he had looked into the current application with a fresh mindset. Councillor Jackson stated that he didn't think the application was acceptable. He argued that there had been minimal changes made to the application and that these changes didn't address the objections raised against the application. Councillor Jackson outlined his view that the extensions would be out of character and detrimental to the area. He stated that he believed Mrs Johnson had put forward a convincing case and so had Waltham Parish Council. Councillor Jackson reiterated that he viewed this application as unacceptable and that the changes from the previous application had been minimal. He stated that the previous application had been voted against unanimously and he hoped to see the same happen in regards to this application.

Mr Moss spoke as the Chairman of Waltham Parish Council in objection to the application. Mr Moss argued that there had only been one minor change to the design of the dormer that differentiated this application from the initial application which was previously refused by the committee. Mr Moss stated that the parish council view was that the proposed extension did not reflect the character of the area, it was too large and was an overdevelopment of the site. Mr Moss stated that all properties in Lytham Drive had an external wall finish of plain brick with natural timber on the gable ends. He argued that this application proposed full render but did not specify a particular finish or colour and the proposed timber effect cladding to the front elevation also did not specify a finished colour. Mr Moss reiterated that the parish council did not consider that the minor change to the style of the dormer would reduce the dominating impact the neighbours at number 19 felt it would have on their own adjacent property.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he supported the objections made by the parish council and argued that minimal changes had been made to the plans in the application. Councillor Mickleburgh moved for the application to be refused.

Councillor Hasthorpe agreed with Councillor Mickleburgh that no substantial changes had been made to this application, he seconded the application for refusal.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that there had not been many changes made to the plans and that the extensions could create a dominance to the site.

Councillor Parkinson stated that potentially there was an overemphasis in the need to have the street scene to be similar, he argued a varied street scene could be better. Councillor Parkinson expressed his concern, however, that the extension would cause the applicant's property and the neighbours property to be too close together. Councillor Parkinson stated that he would reluctantly support refusal of this application.

Councillor Hudson stated that it was a difficult decision to make as Planning Officers said it was acceptable, but everyone else was against the approval of the application. Councillor Hudson stated that he was reassured by the fact that an appeal had been logged regarding refusal of the previous application as the decision would therefore be checked by an Inspector. He stated that he would reluctantly support the refusal of the application.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she was unsure about the application. She stated that she found the report submitted by Planning Officers to be confusing and wasn't sure whether officers were recommending the application to be approved or whether it be refused.

The Chair stated that lots of work went into the reports submitted by Planning Officers and praised them for all their hard work.

Councillor Goodwin clarified that she was aware of the hard work that Planning Officers undertake but expressed that she found this specific report to be confusing and unconvincing.

Councillor Beasant stated that he found it extremely difficult to reach a decision regarding the application. He stated he would have preferred a site visit to be able to visualise the impact the extensions would have on the adjoining properties. Councillor Beasant stated that he believed he would vote to approve the application but reiterated that he would have preferred a site visit.

Mr Dixon clarified with the committee that the reason behind the motion for refusal was over development. This was confirmed by Councillor Mickleburgh and Councillor Hasthorpe.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused because the development would constitute an over development of the site to the detriment of the character of the street scene and adjacent residential amenity contrary to Policy 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

(Note - the committee voted nine for and two against in favour of the application being refused.)

Item Two - DM/0744/21/FUL – Caravan at The Shepherds Purse, Bradley Road, Bradley

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained that it sought consent to site four glamping pods with associated works, install a welfare unit and to install a storage facility with associated works. Mr Limmer stated that the applicant was an elected member of North East Lincolnshire Council. He also stated that Bradley Parish Council had objected to the application citing lack of detail in the application. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed development would support both a prosperous rural economy and rural leisure and tourism within the borough and not significantly harm the character and landscape quality of the area or neighbouring properties amenities. Mr Limmer stated that the application therefore aligned with Policies 5, 12, 33, and 42 of the NELLP and subject to a number of safeguarding conditions and the results of a consultation undertaken by Northern Power, the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he disagreed with the objections raised by Bradley Parish Council. He didn't view the application as too minimal in detail and didn't see any issues with the application. Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he understood the reasoning why this application had been brought to the committee, with the applicant being an elected member of the Council. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the motion for the application to be approved.

The Chair stated that he was pleased to see progress being made to the site as this had previously been requested.

Councillor Parkinson stated that it was his belief that the pods would help with tourism as glamping pods were becoming more popular in campsites. Councillor Parkinson stated that he would vote for approval of the application.

Councillor Pettigrew said that he believed the site would work well and the glamping pods would enhance the site and have a positive impact on tourism to the area. He praised officers for their hard work on the application.

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 Three - DM/1090/21/FUL - Former Doric Anderton Premises, King Edward Street, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought change of use from an industrial building to a gymnastics academy. Mr Dixon informed the committee that a number of objections had been raised regarding concerns of parking and also the proximity the gymnastics academy would have to another gymnastics academy. Mr Dixon clarified that business competition was not a reason to refuse planning permission. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed development was considered acceptable and that there were no local amenity or highway concerns, and the application also accorded with policies 5, 22, 23, 33 and 38 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 – 2032. Mr Dixon stated that the application was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Nicol spoke as the applicant for the application. He outlined to the committee that the purpose of the gymnastics school was to get as many people involved in gymnastics as possible. Mr Nicol also stated that his organisation had supported the local community and would continue to do so from their new base. Mr Nicol outlined that the current place that they ran their classes from required them to close for a period. He said that this can prove difficult for them as his members need support all year-round. Mr Nicol also stated that he believed that relocation to the town centre would help attract more people to his centre. Mr Nicol also informed the committee that he would look to hold all competitions on Sundays to help with any parking concerns. Mr Nicol stated that he did not feel that it was controversial to open a gymnastics school close to another one stating that we had clothes shops close together. Mr Nicol thanked the committee for their time and stated that if approved, he was looking forward to bringing a vacant building back into use.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he fully supported the application.

Councillor Hudson stated that he supported the application and believed that the gymnastics school would be positive for the area. Councillor Hudson moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he fully supported the application and was pleased that it would bring back a vacant building to use. Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he believed it would be a great addition to the community.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she thought it would be good for the local area as lots of kids were on waiting lists to get into clubs. Councillor Goodwin stated that she believed parking would be fine. Councillor Goodwin said she would support the approval of this application.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that he had personal experience with trying to get kids into clubs and knew how difficult this could be. Councillor Pettigrew stated that he fully supported the application and seconded the motion for the application to be approved.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he viewed the application as all positive but raised a query regarding roof flooring.

Mr Dixon stated that this was not something Planning Officers would get involved with and would be up to the applicant.

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

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

Item Four - DM/0602/21/FULA – 3 Oak Street, Healing

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect a two storey side extension with roof lights to provide a car port with bedroom in roof space above. Mr Dixon outlined that the application was considered to have a negative impact on the street scene and wider character of the area, as well as neighbouring amenity. He also outlined that the application was considered to not accord with policy 5 and 22 of the NELLP and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Smith spoke as the agent for the application. He explained that the objective was to create a new master bedroom as the house needed a study with the applicant now working from home. Mr Smith stated that when concerns were raised by planning officers, they responded by reducing the size and changed the application to minimise the impact to the street scene. Mr Smith also explained that there had been no objections from the parish council and said that previous applications had been approved with similar sizing to that of this application. Mr Smith stated that with this precedent in mind, he asked that members be consistent with their approach.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he had listened to both sides, and had also heard various comments from other locals, hence him calling the application in for committee consideration. He argued that this application would completely alter the street scene. He also said he did not think previous applications were relevant as they were not bungalows. Councillor Hasthorpe moved that this application be refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the motion for refusal. He stated he was surprised that there had been no comments from the parish council. Councillor Mickleburgh suggested that if a compromise was met, then the application could return to a future meeting of this committee for consideration.

Councillor Hudson stated that he did not think it looked that bad, he said that the bungalows looked interesting but acknowledged it would affect the street scene. Councillor Hudson expressed concern about the upstairs neighbour's window. He also stated that he understood officers suggesting a hip but this would dramatically change the room space.

Councillor Hudson stated that he was unsure about this application, and he would listen to other members before making a decision.

Councillor Croft stated that she agreed with Councillor Hudson, she thought it looked good, but she was unsure about this application. She said she would listen to other members also.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that it was on the large size, but thought hip would work and if that was the case, it would have been no problem. Councillor Pettigrew stated that he agreed with planning officers' recommendation for refusal for now.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he understood Councillor Hudson saying it looked better, but it was a large space. Councillor Parkinson stated that he agreed with Councillor Pettigrew, and that if it had a hip, that would be more acceptable. Councillor Parkinson queried whether officers would accept that and suggested that the application be deferred rather than refused, so officers and the applicant could look at this option.

Mr Dixon stated that the committee could do this, but as Councillor Hudson said there would be loss of floor space. Mr Dixon clarified that the applicant could come back if refused and could appeal the decision.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that it was important that we focus on the application in front of us and not what it could be.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused due the development being contrary to Policy 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) and sections 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in that the proposed extension would be harmful to the street scene and wider area and by reason of massing and dominance, the amenity of the neighbouring property.

(Note - the committee voted nine for and two against in favour of the application being refused.)

Item Five - DM/0969/21/FUL – Manor House, Tetney Road, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought a variation of condition 21 (approved plans) pursuant to DM/1099/16/FUL to amend plots 5 and 6 to one dwelling instead of two dwellings and external alterations. Mr Dixon stated that the proposal to vary the approved plans for plots 5 and 6 would result in detrimental harm to the design and ethos of the buildings which were intended to represent a historic farmstead. Mr Dixon stated that this application was recommended for refusal.

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent to the application and stated that the site was now taking shape with work being undertaken. He stated that

the applicant didn't want to change too much as they understood it was a heritage site but did want to change certain things to suit family needs. Mr Snowden argued that the changes would have a subtle positive impact. He stated that the glazed element however was important, and that the application had the support of the parish council. Mr Snowden asked the Committee for their support in approving the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he disagreed with the planning officers. He said that they were not talking about major changes to the historical site, they were talking about a new build as they were wanting to alter old barns. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson stated that he was very pleased with Councillor Mickleburgh's statement and argued that they were sometimes too sensitive with these issues. Councillor Hudson also said that with this plot removed it would cause less traffic in the area. Councillor Hudson seconded the application for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe disagreed with his fellow councillors. He argued that there had been massive changes made to what was originally agreed. He stated that he could not support the application.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he understood the sensitivity of the application and that the ethos must be in the shape of a barn. He stated that had the development gone much further, he would have voted against, but was happy to go with approval. He stated that while the development definitely had a more modern style than the original plan, it was still acceptable in his view.

Councillor Pettigrew stated that it was a unique location, and he could see how much work would have gone into this application as it was not a normal site. He stated that the changes made seemed subtle. Councillor Pettigrew stated that he would vote for the officers' recommendations.

Councillor Goodwin stated that yes there was more glass, which would mean more light, but commented that she couldn't see anything wrong with this application. Councillor Goodwin stated that she agreed with Councillor Hudson and Councillor Mickleburgh.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that if this was a single building there would be no problem but it was part of a site. He argued that you had to take that into consideration. Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he would be voting to refuse the application.

The Chair stated that this application had not been a hot topic in Humberston. The Chair stated that initially when planning permission was given there was concerns about whether it would be built out as 2016 heritage was a big issue and the Chair stated that it was his belief that it shouldn't part from this. The Chair stated that he would vote for refusal of the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with decision being delegated to the Assistant Director of Housing, Highways and Planning following review of required planning conditions.

(Note - the committee six to five in favour of the application being approved. The committee voted unanimously for delegation.)

P.58 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 18th November 2021 to 16th December 2021

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.59 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.60 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.61 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 11.42 a.m.