



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2022

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**5<sup>th</sup> October 2022 at 9.30 a.m.**

**Present:**

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

**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 10 members of the public present and one member of the press.

### **P.34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies were received for this meeting.

### **P.35 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

### **P. 36 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS**

#### **Item 1 - DM/1211/21/FUL - LAND AT BUDDLEIA CLOSE, HEALING**

Mr. Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought erection of eight dwellings to include garages, landscaping and access. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed site for the development was not an allocated site for a particular use but that the site was within the development boundary and was acceptable in principle as policy 5 of the North East

Lincolnshire Local Plan (NELLP) did not preclude development for new housing on unallocated sites within defined settlement boundaries. He said that planning permission on the site had previously been granted in 2016 for ten dwellings. Mr Dixon stated that there had been an objection raised by the Parish Council who had stated that they supported the view of neighbours who had raised concerns over traffic, impact on the existing trees, ecological concerns, and concerns over loss of privacy. Mr Dixon stated that there had been initial concerns over the ash tree on the site, but that the proposed garages would now be located elsewhere on the site to avoid any issues. Mr Dixon stated that the tree officer had raised no concerns. Mr Dixon commented that a full ecology report had been undertaken and that the Ecology Officer had recommended conditions which would be implemented in the plans. Mr Dixon stated that the issue of ownership of the ransom strip land was not a planning concern but that the applicant had assured planning officers that he owned the land. Mr Dixon said that the Highway's Officer had determined that the additional traffic the eight dwellings would cause would not have a severe impact on the overall traffic generation on the highway network. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed site was located in flood zone 1 and was therefore at low risk of flooding. Mr Dixon stated that the Drainage Officer had recommended there be further discussions regarding managing the water flow and that a condition be implemented in the plans. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on neighbours as there would be a distance between properties over 21 metres. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 3, 4, 5, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42 of the NELLP and all relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and was therefore recommended for approval.

Mr Stringer stated that his house bordered the development and that in terms of the overall development he had no objections. Mr Stringer stated that he had concerns over some of the plans. He said that the ransom slip ran full length and that it was his belief that it should be fenced off and that he was concerned that there had been no such provisions outlined in the plans. Mr Stringer stated that there was a row of conifers, and that some were in excess of 60ft and that half of them were on the border and the other half on the development land. Mr Stringer stated that they posed a danger to plot 5 and nearby properties. Mr Stringer stated that they were out of control and needed to be reduced in height.

Mrs Sidhu spoke as the applicant for the development. She said that the application was submitted ten months previous and that since then she had worked closely with planning officers in addressing any concerns. Mrs Sidhu said that the garages had been repositioned and that sustainable water surface designs had been included. She stated that the public footpath would also be improved. Mrs Sidhu stated that the development was of high quality and was the best possible solution regarding the site. Mrs Sidhu informed committee members that the reasoning behind the ground floor being larger was to address any mobility issues in the future and the potential of older members of her family having rooms on the ground floor.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he would like to hear the views of the ward councillors. He said that he took on board the comments made by the parish council.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he had not been approached by anyone regarding concerns about the development.

Councillor Hudson stated that he had missed the Parish Council meeting where they discussed the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he was there and that the Parish Council supported the residents and opposed the application. Councillor Hasthorpe reiterated that he had not received any direct complaints.

Councillor Hudson stated that he thought it was important to note that the principle objector attending the planning meeting, didn't fully object but raised concerns about certain issues.

Councillor Lindley stated that he didn't know the area very well. He said that he thought the plot seemed of an adequate size for eight properties. Councillor Lindley stated that he took on board the words of the Ward Councillors and was happy with the application. He moved for the approval of the application.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he thought the application seemed adequate. Councillor Parkinson queried the issue of ownership of the ransom slip.

Mr Dixon stated that the issue of land ownership for the ransom slip was not a planning consideration.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he had concerns over the 60ft high trees. He said that he would have thought something would have to be done to address the issue.

Mr Dixon stated that condition seven could be amended, which dealt with management of trees issues.

Councillor Parkinson seconded the application for approval with the conditions. Councillor Hasthorpe queried whether the issues raised by Mr Stringer had been covered in the plans.

Mr Dixon reiterated that condition seven could be amended.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he was happy with that.

Councillor Beasant stated that he had concerns over the trees.

He queried whether that issue would be covered under high hedge legislation. He said that he hoped the applicant would address the issue.

Councillor Goodwin said that she agreed with Councillor Beasant. She queried whether the ransom slip land would be fenced.

Mr Dixon stated that, that was a land ownership issue and was not a planning consideration. Mr Dixon stated that high hedge legislation was not in the remit for the planning.

Councillor Lindley stated that he acknowledged the issues around the trees. He moved for the application to be approved with the condition regarding trees added.

Councillor Parkinson seconded the application for approval with the condition added.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

## **Item 2 – DM/0482/22/FUL – LAND SOUTH OF STALLINGBOROUGH ROAD, HEALING**

Mr. Limmer introduced the application and explained it sought the erection of a detached dwelling, with balconies to the rear, swimming pools, creation of new vehicular access, creation of pond and associated works. Mr Limmer stated that the development had been objected to by the parish council who supported the views of neighbours who had objected to the application due to its location, impact on character, its proximity to the Church and traffic issues. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed site for the development was outside of the defined development boundary, however, he explained that due to the council not currently being on target to reach its five-year supply of housing, the application could be considered as long as the benefits outweigh any potential adverse impacts. Mr Limmer explained that the development would be slightly over 12 metres away from the church graveyard area and if the development was approved, residents using the garden could cause disturbance to those mourning and those using the church. Mr Limmer stated that the Heritage Officer had recommended that there should be archaeology investigations undertaken to ensure there was no archaeology of high value that could be lost prior to the determination of the planning application and this had not been done. Mr Limmer stated that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the setting of the church, the cross base, and the scheduled monument. Mr Limmer said that the development would also potentially cause harm to the trees during the construction phase due to the proximity the trees would be to the construction taking place and also present issues to any future occupiers of the development. Mr Limmer stated that the Highways Officer and the Drainage Officer had raised no objections to the development but highlighted that a surface water drainage scheme would be required by the applicant and subsequently assessed by the Drainage Officer. Mr Limmer stated that the application was not in

accordance with policies 5, 22, 39 and 42 of the NELLP and sections 12, 15, 16 of the NPPF and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Ettridge spoke as the applicant. He stated that he was proud of the scheme. He said that the design ethos was created to blend in with the site. Mr Ettridge informed members that while the development was outside of the defined development boundary, there had been two approvals hundred yards away that were both outside of the boundary. He said that more houses were needed, and he believed his scheme was one of high quality and was low carbon. Mr Ettridge stated that the church was hard to see already, and that the development would not block the view. He said that he appreciated the concerns raised by the Heritage Officer and would be happy to implement a condition regarding archaeology investigations.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he had received lots of messages of people outlining their concerns with the development. He said that the design of the development would possibly work in another location, but that the development in the proposed location would be too close to the church and the graveyard. He stated that he thought it was a disrespectful place for the development and moved for refusal of the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the motion of the refusal. He stated that he thought the development was not suitable for Healing and would suit a more modern area. He said that while we need to support housing needs, this would only be one property.

Councillor Goodwin stated that she would like to hear more debate about the application. Councillor Goodwin queried whether tree preservation orders could be put onto the trees.

The Chair confirmed that many of the trees on and around the site benefitted from Tree Preservation Orders.

Councillor Hudson stated while he thought that the application was interesting, it was not supported by residents or the parish council. Councillor Hudson stated that Healing had been through a period of lots of growth and that residents were keen to protect green spaces. He said that he also had concerns over the development's proximity to the graveyard.

Councillor Dawkins stated that he was pleased to see an eco-property design but that the proposed site for the property was the wrong one. He said that he would be supporting refusal.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he had called in the application as he had found the design interesting. He said the design had merit and that Healing could benefit from a modern attractive development.

Councillor Lindley said that the proposed site was wrong for the development. He said that if it the development was for another site, it could potentially be approved. Councillor Lindley stated that he had concerns over damage to the environment. He stated that there had been a huge public outcry over the development and commented that he would be supporting refusal of the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that there were rumours of tunnels underground at the location. He said his main concern was the issue of proximity to the graveyard and the potential intrusion that could occur.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 10 for and 1 against the application to be refused.)

### **Item 3 - DM/0450/22/DEM– THORPE PARK HOLIDAY CAMP, ANTHONYS BANK ROAD, HUMBERSTON, GRIMSBY**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought to demolish five amenity blocks. Mr Dixon stated that the application was not a standard planning application and that members could only consider two points when determining whether to approve or refuse the application. He said that members needed to consider the means of demolition and how the site would be restored. Mr Dixon stated that planning permission was not needed to change the use of the site as this had already been established through previous lawful use applications. Mr Dixon stated that the buildings would be demolished safely and also in a way that reduced the impact on amenity for users of holiday camp. Mr Dixon stated that there would also be measures put in place to protect nearby trees and these measures had been approved by the trees officer. Mr Dixon said that the land would be levelled out following demolition and would be grassed over to match the surrounding area. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with conditions and was therefore recommended for approval.

Mr Smith spoke as the applicant and said that the demolition would take place during the sites closed season. He said that each site would be levelled following the demolition and that the plans were supported by the relevant officers. Mr Smith stated that Haven would like to apologise to any residents of static caravans who had not been communicated with in the best way. Mr Smith explained that all tourism sites needed improvement and needed to progress. Mr Smith stated that the demolition would be phased and that no static caravan users would be without amenities. Mr Smith stated that the parks general manager would continue to speak to owners throughout the process. Mr Smith stated that he wanted to assure members that the demolition would form much more of a wider plan for the site and its improvement.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that when considering only the two issues, he was happy to move for the approval of the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the motion of approval.

Councillor Hudson stated that he supported the application.

Councillor Parkinson stated that the amenities were also used by tourism caravans and not just the static caravans.

Mr Dixon stated that the change of use of the site could not be considered by members as a means of refusing the application. He said members could only consider means of demolition and site restoration.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he had concerns over loss of amenities. He said that at the last tourism scrutiny meeting, there was discussions over the need for more amenities.

The Chair stated that he understood the objections raised by Councillor Parkinson and the objections raised in the petition but that members could only look at the planning considerations.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved.

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

#### **Item 4 - DM/1195/21/FUL – LAND AT CHURCH LANE, HUMBERSTON GRIMSBY**

This item was withdrawn.

#### **Item 5 - DM/0964/21/FUL – LAND AT CHURCH LANE, HUMBERSTON GRIMSBY**

This item was withdrawn.

#### **Item 6 - DM/ 10412/21/FUL - LAND AT CHURCH LANE, HUMBERSTON GRIMSBY**

This item was withdrawn.

**P.37 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 26th August 2022 – 22nd September 2022

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

**P.38 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.39 EXCLUSION OF PRESSS 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.40 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 10.48 am