



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 29th September 2022

PLANNING COMMITTEE

7th September at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Pettigrew (in the Chair)
Councillors Beasant, Callison (substitute for Batson) Croft, Dawkins, Goodwin, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Mickleburgh, Parkinson and Smith (substitute for Lindley)

Officers in attendance:

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

Others in attendance:

There were 6 members of the public present and no members of the press.

P.25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Batson and Lindley

P.26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hasthorpe declared a prejudicial interest in Item 1 of p.27 DM/0872/20/FUL as he had publicly made his views known on the application.

Councillor Smith declared a personal interest in Item 5 of p.27 DM/0393/22/OUT as he had previously worked with the applicant on developments nearby.

P. 27 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Councillor Hasthorpe left the meeting at this point.

Item 1 - DM/0872/20/FUL - CLOVERDALE RESIDENTIAL HOME, BUTT LANE, LACEBY, GRIMSBY

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought erection of 1 detached and 6 semi-detached dwellings with garages, new access, and landscaping - additional land contamination information. Mr Limmer explained that the site was outside of the defined development boundary. He stated that authorities could consider developing on areas not allocated for housing and areas outside of the defined development area if the authority was below the level of supply of sufficient homes outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework and if the developments are sustainable and comply with Local Planning Policies. Mr Limmer stated that NELC was below the target level of supply of sufficient homes and due to that, the development was acceptable in principle. Mr Limmer informed committee members that a drainage plan had been submitted and that the Drainage Team had considered the plan and determined that the development would not increase the risk of flooding. Mr Limmer stated that the Highways Team had not raised any objections to the development. Mr Limmer stated that the development would not be out of character with the area as the proposed dwellings had been reduced from two storey houses to single storey with rooms in the roofspace, and were now at the same scale as the care home. He said that there would not be many openings facing nearby properties and that the distance between the proposed and existing dwellings would not cause unacceptable privacy issues or massing. Mr Limmer explained that the proposed development would be built on an historic landfill site and that due to this, testing had taken place regarding contamination. Mr Limmer informed committee members that a full phase two ground investigation report had been submitted by the applicant. He said that elevated levels of lead and arsenic from trial holes had been found. Mr Limmer said that the report had recommended that a 600m soil cover system be put across all soft landscaped areas of the development. Mr Limmer informed committee members that the Council's Environment Health Officer had recommended further testing be undertaken including a gas membrane and that further mitigation be put in place. Mr Limmer stated that the issue of contamination had raised concerns but that both the NELC Environmental Health Officer and the Environment Agency had not objected to the development as long as the conditions and mitigation they were recommending were complied with. Mr Limmer stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33 and 41 of the NEELLP 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) and following advice from the NPPF, the application was recommended for approval.

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent of the application. He stated that the application had been originally submitted back in October asking for planning permission for seven houses. He said that since then he had worked closely with the Planning Department and had made changes to the application including altering the designs to bungalows rather than houses and undertaking contamination testing on the site. Mr Snowden

stated that the site was surrounded by residential properties and was close to schools and public amenities. He said that the Council was not currently meeting its target for new housing and that the development would help. Mr Snowden stated that the Council's Drainage Team supported the application. He said that full phase two contamination testing had been carried out and following that mitigation would be put in place. Mr Snowden informed committee members that an ecology report had been carried out and that there had been no objections from the Ecology Officer. Mr Snowden said that he felt that the neighbour's concerns had been addressed with the reduction made from houses to bungalows. He stated that the application had total support from Council officers. Mr Snowden said that two cars would be able to get past on the access road and would be seen from both sides. Mr Snowden stated that he thought the development would be a great addition to the local area.

Councillor Dawkins queried the issue of contamination. He said that while he understood they had drilled 2-3 metres down, surely contamination could be further down than that.

Mr Limmer reiterated that there would be further testing regarding contamination on the site.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he had spoken to a member of the public who remembered when the site was a tip and they had two main concerns. Councillor Mickleburgh said that those concerns had been addressed by Mr Limmer and he was happy to see that a gas membrane would be undertaken. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that he agreed with Councillor Mickleburgh. He stated that had the application still included the building of two storey houses, he would not have supported it due to issues of overlooking. He said that he was happy with the separation of the properties and the revised plan. Councillor Hudson seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Callison said that the residential care home nearby was fairly new and surely would have had similar testing carried out and no objections raised.

Mr Dixon clarified that the development had had some rounds of gas testing but more would be done for completeness. There were no issues. He informed Councillor Dawkins that the contamination testing had gone deeper than three metres in some boreholes to get to base material.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Councillor Hasthorpe returned to the meeting.

Item 2 – DM/0367/22/FUL – REAR OF 132 CAMPDEN CRESCENT, CLEETHORPES

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought the erection of two dwellings with associated works to the rear of Campden Crescent, Cleethorpes. The proposal is for sheltered housing associated with the charity Foresight, providing for the needs of people with disabilities. Mr Dixon informed committee members that the site for the proposed development was located within flood zone three and was therefore considered to be at high risk of flooding. Mr Dixon stated that the site did not pass the necessary sequential test, as there were other areas outside of that level of flood risk where houses could be built. He also said that the development was not one which would bring regeneration to the local area. Mr Dixon said that as the requirements to pass the sequential test had not been achieved, the development was not acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon informed committee members that the applicant had stated that he would raise ground floor levels by one metre to mitigate the flood risk, however he said that this would cause issues of overlooking and massing and be detrimental to neighbours. Mr Dixon stated that the design of the two dwellings was acceptable but that the dwellings would look cramped on the site and would be in close proximity to the community centre. Mr Dixon said that the council's Highway's officer had raised an objection to the application citing concerns of more vehicles using the access and the access being too narrow for vehicles to pass. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed development did not accord with Policies 5, 22, 33, 34 or 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and following advice from NPPF, the application was recommended for refusal.

The applicant Mr Nelson provided a statement and this was read out by Miss Pickerden.

Mr Nelson wrote in the statement that the original application to build five dwellings had been refused planning permission in April 2021 and that the current proposal sought consent for much needed two-bedroom properties for disabled and vulnerable members of the community who wish to access affordable housing to live independently. Mr Nelson wrote in the statement that Foresight already had people lined up to move into the properties and that the end occupiers do not own motor vehicles. He wrote that while he acknowledged that it cannot be controlled by a planning condition that occupiers do not own motor vehicles, it could be controlled by Foresight. He wrote that parking for visitors could be undertaken safely in the existing car park area to the community centre. Mr Nelson wrote that the properties would be retained by Foresight and that applicants are happy to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that they are never sold off for speculative housing. He wrote that the applicants own the site and the community centre and that it is envisaged that the future occupiers would be able to participate in activities on site. Mr Nelson addressed the officers reports in his statement, he said that a site specific flood risk assessment with mitigation had been prepared for the site and had not been objected to by

the Environment Agency. He wrote that this included raising the properties by one metre and providing sleep accommodation at first floor level. Mr Nelson wrote that the site was located within a sustainable location and had good access to services and amenities, which would reduce the reliance on travel via the private motor car. Mr Nelson wrote that significant material weight should be given for much needed rented accommodation for disabled and vulnerable people, which would be a clear community benefit. He wrote that the design of the properties had been considered acceptable by planning officers and that the site density had been reduced from five to two properties and each property benefitted from a low maintenance private outside amenity space. Mr Nelson wrote that the properties were designed to not adversely overlook the neighbouring properties and are sited in a way to not create any adverse massing impacts or loss of light. He wrote that the site had historic vehicular access for the community centre and that the proposal would be unlikely to attract end occupiers who would own cars and that this could be controlled by Foresight. He also wrote that car parking spaces could be marked out for visitors within the existing car parking area, and this could be enforced by a planning condition. Mr Nelson wrote that fire sprinkler systems would be installed within the properties and that this was common practice for developments off private drives. Mr Nelson wrote that a temporary access was proposed through the allotments during the construction phase to avoid any potential conflict with current residents and due to the width of the access roadway. He wrote that a small section of hedging and fencing would be removed to facilitate access to the site and reinstated once construction was completed. Mr Nelson wrote that he hoped committee members could see the clear planning benefits of the scheme designed specifically for Foresights needs and support approval of the application.

Councillor Green spoke as Ward Councillor for the area. She said that she understood that there was a shortage of properties for disabled people, but that other sites in the area would be able to accommodate this. Councillor Green commented that she believed that the site being proposed was not appropriate. She said that the Highways Department had identified an issue and that permission should be refused due to access issues. Councillor Green stated that Foresight had identified that there would be disabled people living in the properties and they would need full access to emergency services and the access was too narrow for this. She said that the access was not suitable in an emergency and that there would also be issues on bin emptying day. Councillor Green said that there would be an impact on birds and other wildlife by using the allotments area during construction, and she said that this would be harmful.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that access was a problem and that it is a struggle to drive down into the area. He said that emergency vehicles would not be able to. Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he had concerns over the issue of flooding and that the sequential test needed to be passed. He said that even if residents did not own a motor vehicle, they would still have people visiting them. He stated that the application was too risky and seconded the motion of refusal.

Councillor Parkinson said that he had walked round the site previously and thought that it was large site but that the entrance was a problem. He said that it was the wrong place for the development.

Councillor Hudson stated that he thought the current application was an improvement from the last but that the issues are still present. He said that the objection from Highway's and the risk of flooding was a serious issue. Councillor Hudson stated that the arguments against the application were compelling.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

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

Item 3 - DM/0202/22/FUL – POPLAR ROAD BUSINESS UNITS, CLEETHORPES

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought to demolish existing stores, erect 16 mixed use (B2 / B8 / E(g)) industrial units, alterations to existing office block, install 38 storage containers, alterations to road layout with new access and various associated works -amended access design and heights of building units to St Heliers Road. Mr Dixon stated that the site was located outside of the boundary for employment land and was located in the urban area of Cleethorpes. He said however that there was no policy that stated that development could not occur elsewhere and that policy 5 of the NEELP promotes sustainable development within the development area of Cleethorpes. Mr Dixon stated that the Highways Team had raised no objections to the application and while traffic levels would increase, the levels would not cause safety issues. Mr Dixon stated that the site was located in flood zone 3, and due to this a Flood Risk Assessment including a sequential test had been undertaken. Mr Dixon said that the application had met the requirements of the sequential test as the development would provide additional employment for local people in a sustainable central Cleethorpes location. Mr Dixon stated that Anglian Water had raised concerns regarding drainage but were accepting of a condition to address the issue. Negotiations were on going. Mr Dixon stated that the Environmental Protection Team had considered the assessment provided by the applicant on contamination and had recommended conditions requiring more detailed assessments in order to determine what mitigation needs to be put in place. Mr Dixon stated that the

benefits the development would bring outweighed the issues raised and that subject to conditions the development would be in accordance with policies 5, 8, 22, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 – 2032 (Adopted 2018) and was recommended for approval.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he was delighted to see the application and that the development would be a huge advantage to the area. He queried whether a highways condition of there being no right turn should be added.

Ms Hattle stated that the Highways Team had reviewed the application and were happy with what was being proposed. She said that the issue of no right turn could be reviewed in the future.

Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the approval of the application.

Councillor Parkinson seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson stated that the site could not be used for housing and therefore welcomed the application.

Councillor Dawkins stated that he supported the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he was happy with the application as it would create employment in the town, which was needed and he said that he would fully support a condition being added as suggested by Councillor Hasthorpe regarding there being no right turn.

The Chair asked Planning Officers to explain what condition could be added.

Mr Dixon stated that there were two options. He said the committee could insist on a no right turn sign now or wait for the Highway Authority to assess the situation when the development had been operating and look to act then. He reminded Planning Committee that the application had been assessed by Highways who had not raised objections.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he would insist on there being a no right turn condition added.

Councillor Parkinson said that he was against the condition being added and instead recommended that a review be undertaken after the work was completed.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded that a condition be added about there being no right turn.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe and Councillor Mickleburgh.

Councillor Dawkins stated that he was against adding the condition and said that pushing everything to the roundabout could have a detrimental effect. He said he would rather a review was undertaken after the work had been completed.

Ms Hattle reiterated that highways had assessed the area and where of the opinion that the application was acceptable in its current form and a condition to not allow a right turn was not needed. She said that a condition could be added but that she believed it would be better to review the situation rather than impose a condition at the current stage.

Councillor Callison stated that he would have liked to see parking for buses included in the application. He said that there was no other venue for them to park at in Cleethorpes.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 8 for and 3 against for the application to be approved.)

Councillor Parkinson left the meeting at this point.

Item 4 - DM/0700/21/FUL – 31 GIBRALTAR LANE, LACEBY

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought change of use from garage to children's nursery with associated works (Amended plans and information dated 4.07.2022 detailing proposed management arrangements). Mr Dixon stated that one of the reasons the application had been brought before the committee was due to an objection from Laceby Parish Council however he said that, the objection had now been withdrawn following further consultation. Mr Dixon stated that the proposal was located within the development boundary. He said that the proposal included changes to the front, rear and side elevations of the garage, including replacing the garage door to a more appropriate door to enable access. Mr Dixon stated that the changes would be minor and would not cause any detrimental impact on the visual amenity or cause adverse overlooking. Mr Dixon stated that there was concern from neighbours regarding an increase in traffic due to changing the use of the garage. Mr Dixon stated that the applicant had confirmed that there would be no need for additional trips from people using the nursery. Mr Dixon said that the Highways Team had raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon stated that the proposal was in accordance with policies 5, 6 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) and was recommended for approval with the decision delegated to the Director of Housing, Highways, Transportation and Planning regarding the expiration of a period of notification ending 20th September 2022, subject to no new planning issues being raised.

Councillor Dawkins queried whether the intention had always been to open a nursery when the garage was built.

The Chair stated that committee members had to look at the application in its current form.

Councillor Goodwin said that she had never had any issues with parking and could not understand what the issue was as the Nursery had been there for years.

Councillor Croft said that she could not see what the problem was and commented that she did not understand why the application had been brought before the Planning Committee.

Councillor Hudson said that when he attended the Parish Council meeting, many people expressed to him how important the Nursery was to the local area.

Councillor Hasthorpe explained that the application was originally called in by him. He stated that he would now support the application as his concerns had been addressed.

Councillor Smith stated that while the garage might not have been built at the time for the correct purposes, he was happy with the application as long as there is area in the driveway to turn. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Croft seconded the motion to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 5 - DM/0393/22/OUT – LAND ADJ OLD NURSERY, CHEAPSIDE, WALTHAM

Mr Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought outline application approval to erect 9 dwellings with access to be considered (Amended access details and additional illustrative plans received 7th July 2022). Mr Limmer explained that the application had been brought before the committee as there had been an objection from Waltham Parish Council and also because the proposed site was outside of the development boundary in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. Mr Limmer stated that the Council had not met the housing target and therefore planning permission could be given as long as the benefits of

doing so outweigh any negative impacts. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed development was acceptable in principle as long as there wasn't significant issues. Mr Limmer said that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the area. Mr Limmer informed committee members that there would be new access and roadway installed in order to facilitate the development, he said that there had been recommendations by the Highways Team to widen the access and subject to this, the Highways Team had no objections. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed site was located in flood zone one and was therefore at low risk of flooding. Mr Limmer stated that there had also been some concerns raised by neighbours regarding maintenance, he said that there would be sufficient space between the boundaries which would allow for maintenance. Mr Limmer concluded that there wasn't any significant issues with the development that would outweigh the need for housing. Mr Limmer stated that the proposal was in accordance with policies 2, 5, 15, 17, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) and sections 5, 11, 12 and 15 of the NPPF and was therefore recommended for approval.

Mr Rands provided a statement objecting to the application. The statement was read out by Miss Pickerden.

Mr Rands wrote in the statement that he had lived at the Old Nurseries for over forty years and that throughout that time the adjacent land had been in agricultural use by Grainsby Farms and that at no time had it been used as a nursery. He wrote that his garden was separated from the proposed site by a short length of boarded fence and a long hawthorn hedge alongside a 6ft wide dyke. Mr Rands wrote in the statement that the hedge had always been maintained by using a tractor mounted hedge trimmer and that this would no longer be possible if the application was approved. He wrote that the dyke needs access for equipment to periodically clean it, to allow for good water flow from their land and for the drainage system from the adjacent fields as well as to prevent flooding. Mr Rands wrote in the statement that the proposed development was on green belt land which was the habitat for numerous wild animals, including badgers, roe deer, muntjac and foxes. He wrote that any new development would have a detrimental effect on their natural activities. Mr Rands wrote in the statement that there were several inaccuracies on the resubmitted plans and that these had been pointed out before. He wrote that their property was a detached house and not a bungalow and that the proposed site had never been used as a nursery. He wrote that the street plan included a bungalow on the north east side of Cheapside but that this had been demolished years ago and was now the location of the only access to the ongoing building site known as the Green. Mr Rands wrote that on the outline plan, plot one was shown as being the nearest dwelling to his house, however the dwelling was not on the building line and would obstruct the natural light and would have direct views into his kitchen windows. Mr Rands wrote in the statement that the development was out of character for the area, was not on land included in the Local Area Plan and was not in line with current

government policy. Mr Rands concluded his statement by writing that the application should be rejected.

Ms Chave spoke as the agent to the application. She said that the site where the development would be built is adjacent to land with a similar development. She stated that the development would be small but a good addition to the local area. Ms Chave informed committee members that the rear of the site would extend no further than where the existing properties extend to. She said that the proposal includes a mixture of houses and bungalows and would help the Council meet its targets. Ms Chave said that the development would create a net gain on biodiversity and pointed out that a pond, plants and wildlife had been included within the plans for the development. Ms Chave stated that she had liaised with the Highways Team and ensured that the access was appropriate. She concluded by asking committee members to support the application.

The Ward Councillor for Waltham, Councillor Philip Jackson provided a statement objecting to the application. The statement was read out by Miss Pickerden.

Councillor Jackson wrote in his statement that he objected to the application as the proposed site was not included in the local plan as a housing site and was instead on agricultural land. He wrote that the proposed site was not in a sustainable location due to its distance from local services and public transport. Councillor Jackson wrote that Cheapside already had considerable road safety issues without the addition of further housing. He wrote in his statement that a similar application on the site had been refused by the committee and that the committee should be consistent in their approach. Councillor Jackson wrote that Waltham Parish Council objected to the application and that Waltham had already seen a major increase in housebuilding on several sites that had not yet been built out and that Waltham did not have the infrastructure to support further development. Councillor Jackson concluded in his statement that he hoped the committee would take into account the points he had made and would refuse the application. Councillor Hudson queried whether the Committee were content with building on the whole section of the road, he said that the proposed site was open countryside and that was why a similar application had been refused. Councillor Hudson stated that he was very much against the application as he believed the committee should protect the local countryside. He said he would like to refuse the application but he commented that where the application to go to appeal, it could be passed. Councillor Hudson stated that he was concerned about the increase in development sites in Waltham.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he agreed with Councillor Hudson, that if the application was to be refused, it would go to appeal and potentially get approved. He said that he thought that the Parish Council and the neighbours had made good points. Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be approved.

The Chair stated that he agreed with Councillor Hudson. He said that there was many housing developments sites in Waltham. The Chair said that there were issues with the road on Cheapside and there had been accidents. The Chair stated that the road was not ideal.

Councillor Smith declared a personal interest and left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he didn't like to see houses being built on land in the countryside and on principle he would reject the application. He stated however that were the application to go to appeal, it could be passed and the Council would endure costs. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Dawkins stated that he wouldn't want to approve an application that he didn't agree with. He said that were the application to go to appeal, it might be approved but it also might not. He stated that he would not be supporting the application and moved for the application to be refused.

Councillor Beasant said that he had expected more of objections to the application. He commented that he liked the biodiversity of the application and the use of flowers. He said that it was important to protect the countryside and thought the application was the best of a bad job if it was going to have housing on the site. Councillor Beasant stated that more help was needed in regard to building on Brownfield Sites. He said that if there was currently houses being built on Brownfield Sites, then he would vote against the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that at the present time, the application was an outline application.

The committee voted 4 for and 5 against the approval of the application.

Councillor Dawkins moved for the application to be refused.

Councillor Hudson seconded the motion to refuse the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee 5 for and 4 against the application being refused.)

Councillor Smith returned to the meeting.

Item 6 - DM/0549/22/PNCOM – 40 ST PETERS AVENUE, CLEETHORPES

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought prior approval for the partial change of use of ground floor, first floor and roof space of building (Use Class E) to provide 5 self-contained flats (Use

Class C3) (Amended Description) in accordance with applicant's agent email dated 24th August 2022 omitting the top flat (flat 6). Mr Dixon stated that following a period of public consultation, some objections had been received citing concerns of loss of retail use, loss of privacy, traffic and parking. Mr Dixon stated that the Highways Team had raised no objections to the application and that there was parking available on the public highway and a nearby public car park. Mr Dixon stated that the Environmental Protection Team had recommended conditions relating to hours of construction. Mr Dixon said that the proposed site was located in flood zone one which was the zone of the lowest risk of flooding. Mr Dixon stated that the proposal would not increase the run off rate or affect drainage in the area. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been considered against the relevant criteria and it had been concluded that prior approval be granted.

Mr George spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that he was aware of the reason the application had been brought before the committee but stated that the issues do not carry weight. He said that the commercial aspect to the development would be retained whilst also providing five new homes. He stated that the development would stimulate investment into the main shopping area of the town centre.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that the high street was changing and was no longer solely about retail. He said that having five new homes would help businesses in the area and moved for approval of the application.

Councillor Dawkins stated that he thought it was a good use of the space and welcomed the application. He seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Callison stated that initially he had concerns about the application. He said he was happy to see the retail aspect being kept and that there was car parking facilities close by. He queried the issue of acoustics, and whether a test should be undertaken.

The Chair stated that the issue of acoustics had been dealt with.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he fully supported the application.

RESOLVED – That Prior Approval be granted.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for Prior Approval to be granted.)

Item 7 - DM/0305/22/FUL – MORRISONS, HILMORE ROAD, LACEBY.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought the erection of coffee shop with drive-thru facility (amended plans and documents dated 27.07.2022 detailing internal highways re-configuration). Mr Dixon stated

that the proposed site was located within the development boundary for Grimsby, he said the building would have a modern design and would not be out of character with the area as the building would incorporate the use of similar materials to that of the fast-food restaurant and supermarket close by. Mr Dixon stated that there would be revised site plan in order to address potential congestion on the highway network. Mr Dixon said that there was low chance of flooding at the proposed site and that the applicant had provided a drainage strategy which had received no objections from the Council's Drainage Team. Mr Dixon stated that there had been objections to the application from residents in nearby properties citing concerns of littering, anti social behaviour and hours of operation. Mr Dixon said that these concerns had been addressed by the Environmental Health Team and that the conditions recommended had been included. Mr Dixon stated that the proposal was in accordance with policies within the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 – 2032 (Adopted 2018) and was recommended for approval.

Mr Proctor spoke as the agent for the application. He stated that a similar application had been approved in 2019, he commented that there was a precedent for these applications. Mr Proctor stated that there had been no objections raised from any technical consultees. He said that there had been objections raised by some neighbours. Mr Proctor stated that an Environmental Health Officer had considered these issues and had recommended mitigation such as opening hours as well as a litter management strategy. He said that the mitigation would be enforced. Mr Proctor stated that he hoped committee members would take into account the points he had made and approve the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that the issues he had with the application had been addressed. He said that he could not see any charging points for electric vehicles in the plans. Councillor Hasthorpe moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Goodwin said that she initially was against the application due to concerns over traffic. She said that traffic has backed up on the main road before particularly during the Christmas period. She said she doesn't know whether a mini roundabout would help.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he had also had concerns over levels of traffic. He said that he understood the concerns raised by Councillor Goodwin but that the addition of two lanes would help alleviate the problem.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought the application would improve the issue of traffic and seconded the motion to approve the application.

Councillor Croft stated that he supported the application and said that she thought there would be an improvement regarding traffic.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee 8 for and 2 against for the application to be approved.)

P.28 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 28th July 2022 – 25th August 2022

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.29 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.30 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.31 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The committee considered any requests from any member of the committee to discuss any enforcement issues.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 12:10 pm

There was a pre application presentation regarding the part re-development of Freshney Place when the meeting had ended.