



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2023

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**30th November 2022 at 9.30 a.m.**

### **Present:**

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

### **Officers in attendance:**

- Jonathan Cadd (Senior Town Planner)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Keith Thompson (Specialist Property Lawyer)

### **Others in attendance:**

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

### **P.49 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence were received for this meeting.

### **P.50 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

### **P.51 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS**

#### **Item 1 - DM/0869/22/PAT - Land East of Grimsby Road, Waltham**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought the erection of an 18-metre phase 8 monopole complete with wraparound cabinet at base and associated ancillary works. Mr Dixon stated that the application was not for full planning permission, only prior approval. Mr

Dixon informed committee members that a similar application had recently been refused in Waltham due to concerns regarding the proposed location. He said that the current application was in response to the recently refused application and that the monopole had been moved further out the way. Mr Dixon stated that the location was now considered acceptable, and that the monopole would be on the opposite side to the footpath. Mr Dixon informed committee members that other monopoles had been put up around North East Lincolnshire. Mr Dixon stated that the application was acceptable under policy 35 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and prior approval was recommended under part 16, schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning Order 2015.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he didn't notice the existing ones and that he thought the location for the monopole was sensible. He moved for approval of the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought the monopole would blend in and that they must be put somewhere. He seconded the application for approval.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that people need the technology, and that he thought the location was good for the monopole. He said that if people want the technology, you must have the infrastructure.

Councillor Lindley said that he was delighted to see the application at the committee as the area needed the technology. He said that the location for the monopole was in the area of the strategic gap and that the introduction of the mast showed sign of no intent to build in that area, which he said he was pleased to see.

Councillor Batson stated that the monopole would only work for a specific area and then would not work and would need boosting by smaller masts. He said that there were no plans as to where the council would scatter these and that he had asked for a full plan. Councillor Batson stated that he was not against the application but that the mast would not help if people were in a car. He said that there was also still a debate on the potential of health concerns that could be caused.

The Chair stated that Councillor Batson had raised some good points, but that those issues should be looked at outside of the committee.

Councillor Croft queried whether the land behind the monopole would be developed.

Mr Dixon said the land did not have permission to be developed but that landowner had indicated that he was interested in building on the land in his representations on the application.

**RESOLVED** – That Prior Approval be granted.

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

## **Item 2 – DM/1147/21/FUL – Former Haiths Bird Seed, 65-69 Park Street Cleethorpes**

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained it sought change of use to six commercial units including a garage/vehicle maintenance unit, MOT station, storage units and one self-contained residential apartment, including alterations, installation of shutters, car parking, loading areas, fire escape, bin store and associated works. Mr Cadd informed committee members that the applicant was planning on living in the residential apartment. Mr Cadd stated that the site had been vacant since 2007 but that it retained its lawful use as a class B2 factory with associated storage. He said that a separate former Haiths storage unit opposite across Brereton Avenue had already been given planning permission for use as a garage/ car sales and MOT business and operated without undue nuisance. Mr Cadd said that the applicant had already commenced development on site but had now halted that work when enforcement officers spoke to him about this. Mr Cadd informed committee members that the applicant had apologised for this. He said that the MOT garage was being used but that this was the only part of the building currently operational. Mr Cadd stated that the fire escape proposed to the rear of the building had also been partially installed along with various roller shutters, windows and partial cladding to both the Brereton Avenue and Park Street frontages. Mr Cadd stated that the site was allocated for housing and that a previous appeal for housing had been fought, in 2012, on viability grounds due to the lack of affordable housing and education contribution offered with that scheme. Despite this the housing was allowed. Mr Cadd stated that since then, and despite the permission being unencumbered by contributions and a prolonged housing boom, no development had occurred. Mr Cadd informed committee members that the application would be a departure from the Local Plan but that the proposal, in the light of any realistic housing proposals represented a betterment for the area. It was noted that any commercial scheme was likely to generate some noise and nuisance to immediate neighbours, noted in objections, but that the existing lawful use of the site/buildings had to be taken into account and that conditions sought to reduce impacts through limited hours of operation, obscure glazing, specific noise mitigation measures and the screening of the rear fire escape. Mr Cadd stated that the application, subject to proposed conditions would be in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 36 and 38 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Dawkins said that he was surprised nothing had happened to the site over the years. He said he welcomed the application and thought it was a good use of the site. Councillor Dawkins said that he supported start up businesses and that he didn't think there would be a negative impact on other properties in terms of overlooking. He moved for the application to be approved.

Councillor Lindley stated that he agreed with Councillor Dawkins. He said that when buildings like the one in the application were left, they tend to fall into disrepair. He said he didn't want to see that happen in the area. Councillor Lindley said that the area was comprised of a mixture of residential properties and businesses. He said that it was good that a building was being brought back into use. Councillor Lindley stated that the building would be in risk of being vandalised eventually if left. He seconded the application for approval.

Councillor Hudson said that he understood why the location was designated for housing but that no one had opted to build on it for ten years. He said that the application would lead to an improvement to the street scene and that we should support businesses.

Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he agreed with what the words of the other members. He said that the application would create jobs for the area.

Councillor Hasthorpe queried the fire escape and whether it should be enclosed. He thought this should be a condition added to the application.

Mr Cadd stated that the condition was already in the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

## **P.52 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 20<sup>th</sup> October 2022 – 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

## **P.53 PLANNING APPEALS**

The committee received a report from the Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Resources regarding outstanding planning appeals.

Councillor Dawkins queried whether people needed to approach officers beforehand to speak at the hearing regarding DM/0068/22/OUT Land South of Church Lane, Humberston.

Mr Dixon stated that interested parties should contact the Planning Inspectorate beforehand.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

**P.54 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.55 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 10.03 a.m.