



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 27th July 2023

PLANNING COMMITTEE

26th April 2023 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Pettigrew (in the Chair)

Councillors Aisthorpe (substitute for Beasant), Batson, Croft, Dawkins, Goodwin, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Lindley, Mickleburgh and Parkinson

Officers in attendance:

- Martin Dixon (Head of Development)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Cheryl Jarvis (Development Manager)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Hannah Steer (Solicitor)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Farren (Sidney Sussex Ward Councillor)
- Councillor Shepherd (Scartho Ward Councillor)

There were 24 members of the public present and one member of the press.

P.86 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received for this meeting from Councillor Beasant.

P.87 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Pettigrew declared a pecuniary interest in Item 3 of P.88 DM/0618/22/FUL as he is a friend of the architect.

Councillor Goodwin declared a non-registrable interest in Item 4 of P.88 DM/0838/21/FUL as she used to be a governor at the school.

Councillor Mickleburgh declared a non-registrable interest in Item 7 of P.88 DM/0303/22/FUL as his father is a retired Methodist minister and served at the church.

DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS**Item 1 - DM/0188/23/PNSOL – Thorpe Park Holiday Camp, Anthony Banks Road, Humberston Fitties, Humberston.**

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to install solar panels. He stated that there had been lots of representations received from residents at the Humberston Fitties outlining concern over the impact the solar panels would have on the conservation of the Humberston Fitties. Mr Dixon said that solar panels were permitted development but that the applicant must submit an application in order to determine whether prior approval of the local planning authority was required for the installation. Mr Dixon stated that it had been determined that prior approval was required. He said that the main issues for consideration were the potential effects on the character of the area the solar panels would have and the effect on residents. Mr Dixon said that the solar panels would be installed on the roof of two buildings within the site. He said that there were already plants and machinery on the roof. Mr Dixon stated that solar panels were becoming more common and that the solar panels would support the need for sustainable energy sources. Mr Dixon stated that whilst the Humberston Fitties was a conservation area, there was a clear separation between the Humberston Fitties and Thorpe Park Holiday Camp. He said that the council's heritage officer had not raised any concerns regarding the application. Mr Dixon said that the solar panels would not have a negative impact on the character of the area. Mr Dixon said that there had been concerns raised by residents of the Humberston Fitties regarding potential glare and noise caused by the solar panels. He said that the separation between the two sites would reduce the impacts in terms of glare. Mr Dixon said that the specific solar panels being proposed to be installed would be dark blue or black and would not reflect the light. He stated that the panels would also have an anti-glare covering and would not generate noise. Mr Dixon stated that a condition had been included regarding construction hours. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with the regulations set out in Town and Country Planning Order 2015 under Schedule 2, Part 14, Class J and that it was therefore recommended that prior approval be granted on the application.

Mr Peet spoke in objection to the application. He said that he was not objecting to the idea of renewable energy sources and said that he thought any business should be applauded for wanting to install solar panels. Mr Peet said that he was concerned about the potential noise from the panels. He stated that he would like the committee to reject the application and ask the applicant to change the plans, so no panels were visible or facing towards a conservation site. Mr Peet said that all equipment should be located within the applicants site boundaries. Mr Peet said that there was currently construction noise coming from Thorpe Park due to other work taking place on the site. He stated that the scheme would harm the character of the area and would harm neighbouring amenities. Mr Peet said that the applicant had a total of 256

acres of land where they could put the solar panels. He said that the application lacked details regarding the battery sources. Mr Peet said that the scheme was misleading regarding noise. Mr Peet asked whether the applicant could confirm where the equipment would be kept.

Mr Bartlett spoke on behalf of the applicant for the application. He said that he had been assisting the applicant, Haven, with their ambition to decarbonise. Mr Bartlett stated that the equipment for the solar panels would be stored internally. He said that climate change was a huge issue that everyone was facing and that the UK recently broke its temperature record. He said that the applicant was embarking on a journey to reduce carbon emissions. Mr Bartlett stated that Thorpe Park was important to the local economy and supported jobs and tourism in the area. Mr Bartlett said that the applicant was seeking prior approval of the panels. The application was not a standard planning application and the issues the committee could consider were the design and appearance of the panels. Mr Bartlett said that the National Planning Policy Framework stated in its guidance that planning authorities should support decarbonisation schemes. Mr Bartlett said that he welcomed the planning officer's assertions that the impact would be minimal. He said that there would be anti-reflective coating which would reduce the glare. Mr Bartlett stated that the heritage officer had not objected to the development, and he welcomed a condition being added regarding the hours of construction. Mr Bartlett said that the applicant had listened to the comments made in the representations and that there would be no visual impact. Mr Bartlett stated that he welcomed the recommendation of approval from the planning officers.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that climate change was not a simple issue. He said that it was important to look positively at things like solar panels. Councillor Mickleburgh said that the objector had made it clear he was not against the concept of solar panels being added but had concerns about where they were being proposed to be put. He said that if the applicant would sit with the objector and discuss the concerns, then the issue could potentially be resolved. He said that the objector had suggested alternative locations for the solar panels. Councillor Mickleburgh stated that he was not against the idea of the solar panels but that the proposal needed to work for residents.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he applauded Thorpe Park for wanting to use solar panels. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that he agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe. He said that everybody should be doing things like this and said that he would like to see solar panels on all roofs particularly industrial roofs. Councillor Hudson commented that there are solar panels on lots of roofs and he didn't see them as having a negative visual impact. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he was not arguing against the need for sustainable energy. He said that the residents hadn't been arguing that

either. Councillor Lindley stated that the key point was that there were two sites to consider, and one was a conservation site. He said that the solar panels were close to the host site's border. Councillor Lindley commented that the positioning of the solar panels was very important. He said that he applauded the use of solar panels and that he thought that developers should put them on all new builds. Councillor Lindley said that whilst he supported the use of solar panels, he was minded not to support approval of the application due to the nature of the two sites.

Councillor Parkinson said that he supported solar panels and said that the positioning of the panels was important. He stated that he agreed with Councillor Hudson and that people get used to things quite quickly. Councillor Parkinson said that the solar panels would merge in with the area. He said that he supported the preserving of the Humberston Fitties but said that there was a need for solar panels. Councillor Parkinson commented that he was fairly happy to support approval of the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that she thought it was important to support approval of the application. She said that she applauded Haven on adding the solar panels. Councillor Goodwin said that the solar panels were not the first one's in the UK and that councillors had been told there would not be a glare so the application should be supported.

RESOLVED – That Prior Approval be granted.

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

Item 2 – DM/0493/22/OUT – Land Off Fieldhouse Road, Humberston.

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it was for outline permission with access to be considered to erect five detached dwelling houses with associated works. She said that the application had been brought before the planning committee due to the number of objections received, a village council objection and a call in request. Ms Jarvis said that the proposed site was an allocated site for housing and was defined and distinctive. She said that the application was currently in the outline stage with only the access being considered. Ms Jarvis stated that it had been determined that a section 106 agreement was not needed. This was because, whilst the proposed site is allocated for seventeen dwellings and the scheme only brought forward part of the site and proposed five dwellings, the site had not been determined to be subdivided due to the existing physical separation in the form of a ditch running through the site and the planning history of the site. Ms Jarvis stated that an area of contention that had been raised by the neighbours was the access and road safety. She said that there had been lots of discussions with the applicant regarding this and that several site visits had taken place. Ms Jarvis said that a road safety audit had been undertaken and that the highways officer had found this to be acceptable

but had recommended a condition be included which was to reduce the height of the fencing at the site's entrance in order to improve visibility. Ms Jarvis said that the highway officer had also determined that the access road was suitable for the five proposed dwellings but had recommended a condition be included which was that work be carried out on the first eight metres of the access in order to provide a passing place. Ms Jarvis said that both of the conditions recommended by the highways officer had been included in the recommendation. Ms Jarvis said that the council's tree officer had raised no objections to the application but had requested that a detailed landscaping scheme be submitted at a later stage. She said that an ecology report had been submitted and had been deemed to be acceptable by the council's ecology officer as long as the recommendations within the report were put in place. Ms Jarvis said that the applicant had provided an archaeological report and that, following this, the council's heritage officer had determined that no harm would be caused should the application be approved. Ms Jarvis stated that the council's rights of way officer had initially raised concerns about the application regarding the footpath. She said that following these concerns, the footpath would be relocated to the rear of the proposed site and would not be fully enclosed but instead have one side fenced. Ms Jarvis said that any further issues regarding the footpath would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage. The council's rights of way officer had also requested that a separate application be submitted by the applicant in order to relocate the public rights of way. Ms Jarvis said that the design of the dwellings would be dealt with at a later stage but that it had been determined that five dwellings could be accommodated on the proposed site. Ms Jarvis said that the exact impact the development would have on neighbours could not be determined as the full detail had not been submitted, however, she said that there was a basis that the impact the development would have on neighbours would be acceptable. Ms Jarvis stated that some neighbours had raised concerns regarding the construction of the development. She said that a condition had been included within the application regarding construction in order to protect the neighbours from noise and nuisance. Ms Jarvis said that the proposed site was located within flood zone one, which she said was preferable for residential development. She said that the council's drainage officer had requested that a sustainable drainage scheme be submitted but had not raised any in principle objections. Ms Jarvis stated that a condition had been included within the application regarding a sustainable drainage scheme. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 6, 13, 22, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Pomfret said that he was an owner of the two bungalows located close to the proposed site. He said that the lane was not suitable for additional dwellings. Mr Pomfret referred committee members to a photo that illustrated the issue regarding road safety. Mr Pomfret said that the proposal to build five dwellings would be too much and would not be in keeping with the area which was mainly an area where there were bungalows and dormer bungalows. Mr Pomfret said that the

development had identified many contentious issues and that seventy percent more volume of traffic would not work. Mr Pomfret said that he was not against the development but said that there were problems regarding safety of the access and lane. Mr Pomfret asked committee members to undertake a site visit.

Mr White said that he was speaking on behalf of the applicant. He said that the photo that had been shown was a staged photo. Mr White stated that the planning department had accepted that the lane was adequate. He said that the lane was four metres wide and then expanded to ten metres. Mr White said that Councillor Dawkins and Councillor Shreeve had visited the site and were happy with what they had seen. He said that the proposals were perfectly suitable and that the manager of the Coach House supported the proposals. Mr White said that the objector had wanted to move the public footpath but the Coach House had disagreed. Mr White said that he wanted to bring both of the footpaths into use and said that he would maintain them. Mr White stated that he would be happy to agree to a condition outlining that. He said that he had worked with planning officers for over a year. Mr White said that the right of way could service twenty homes and that five homes would not make a difference. Mr White said that he would resurface the lane. Mr White asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Dawkins proposed that a site visit be undertaken by the committee.

Councillor Lindley said that he liked to see outline applications as it allowed the applicant a chance to see what concerns there were. He said that he thought the site was appropriate for what was being proposed. Councillor Lindley said that the site was currently overgrown, and that the proposal would dramatically improve the area. He commented that the proposal was consistent with the area. Councillor Lindley stated that he thought more work could be done regarding the access. He said that he saw no benefit to a site visit at the current time. Councillor Lindley said that the objector had raised some issues, but he thought these issues could be resolved with the applicant. He stated that he fully supported the application.

Councillor Goodwin queried whether the footpath would change. She seconded the proposal for a site visit to be undertaken by the committee.

The Chair said that any potential change to the footpath would be dealt with in a different application proposal.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that the applicant had said that a site visit had already taken place with the Ward Councillors.

Councillor Dawkins said that he had previously visited the site as Ward Councillor and that both him and Councillor Shreeve thought it was right for the Planning Committee to visit.

Councillor Hudson said that the site was an allocated site, was in flood zone one and the access was pretty good. He said that the site should have houses on it. He commented that he couldn't really see a reason to object to the application. Councillor Hudson said that he did not believe a site visit was necessary.

Councillor Lindley reiterated that he didn't see the value of a site visit at the current stage. He commented that it was only an outline application and that the Planning Committee membership could be different by the time of the visit. Councillor Lindley said that a site visit could be considered at the detailed stage if the committee at that time wanted one.

The Chair said that he thought a site visit would be more useful at the detailed stage and that a site visit during the current stage could be a waste of time.

Councillor Parkinson stated that he thought it was important if the committee was minded to undertake a site visit that it take place at the current stage as the current stage was about determining the principle of the development.

The Committee took a vote on the proposal for a site visit and upon a vote, 5 voted for and 6 voted against the site visit.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he thought it was a perfectly reasonable application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that the proposed site was within the local plan, ticked all the right boxes and was appropriate to the surrounding areas. Councillor Lindley seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 9 for and 1 against with 1 abstention for the application to be approved.)

Councillor Pettigrew left the meeting at this point.

COUNCILLOR HASTHORPE IN THE CHAIR

Item 3 – DM/0618/22/FUL- 4 Beck Farm Mews, Barnoldby Le Beck.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect two dwellings with garages and various associated works. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the planning committee due to the number of objections and it being outside the development boundary. Mr Dixon said that Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council had also objected to the development. He said that the proposed site was outside of the development boundary but that due to the Council not being able to

demonstrate a five-year supply of sustainable housing, the application could be considered. Mr Dixon said that due to the nature of the proposed site, the development would not cause an inappropriate intrusion into the open countryside and could be assimilated into the area. Mr Dixon said that policy did allow for limited infill, and the development would be limited infill as it was a development of only two dwellings. He said that the application was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon stated that there had been lots of discussions regarding the design of the development. He said that there had been a reduction in dwellings from three to two and that the height of the proposed dwellings had been reduced. Mr Dixon said that the position of the proposed dwellings had also been changed to decrease the overall massing of the site. Mr Dixon said that there were two listed buildings close by to the proposed site, and he said that it had been determined that there was a sufficient distance to ensure no adverse impact on the setting of the listed buildings would be caused. He said that the council's heritage officer had raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon said that the council's ecology officer had not objected to the application but had recommended various conditions to be included within the plans. Mr Dixon said that the council's tree officer had expressed concern regarding the impact the development would have during the construction phase on the trees located within the Old Rectory. Mr Dixon said that it had been determined that the works could be completed without an adverse impact on the trees occurring. Mr Dixon said that the council's trees officer had asked for a detailed landscaping scheme and an arboricultural method statement, he said that conditions requiring these had been included within the application. Mr Dixon said that the proposed site was located within flood zone one which was preferable for residential development. He said that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application and was happy with the sustainable drainage scheme which the applicant had provided. Mr Dixon said that there had been objections raised regarding the access to the site. He said that the council's highways officer had visited the site several times and had determined that the access was acceptable. He said one of the main issues that had been raised by neighbours was concern that large vehicles would not be able to access the site. Mr Dixon recommended to committee members that if they were mindful to approve the application, that the decision be delegated back to the Assistant Director for Housing and Infrastructure, Environment, Economy and Resources to allow for consultation with the Humberside Fire Service to take place to ensure they had no objections. Mr Dixon said that if concerns are raised the application would be referred back to the committee. Mr. Mr Dixon stated that a condition had been added regarding construction management. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 39, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and it was therefore recommended for approval with conditions and the decision delegated to the Assistant Director for Housing and Infrastructure.

Ms Chapman spoke in objection to the application. She said that numerous objections had been submitted and that the parish council supported those objections. She said that the council's policy officer did not think the development was appropriate. Ms Chapman stated that there had been no comments submitted from residents in support of the development. She said that the proposed development was not an infill or conversion. Ms Chapman stated that Beck Farm Mews was accessed through narrow lanes and that increasing the amount of traffic would make the current situation worse. She

said that there was insufficient space for deliveries and said that residents were concerned about traffic issues. Ms Chapman said that the construction management plan submitted did not meet the requirements. Ms Chapman said that residents had strongly expressed that the development would impact the visual amenity of the area. Ms Chapman stated that the application lacked transparency.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that no issues had been raised regarding the principle of the development. Mr Nelson stated that the scheme had been reduced and that there would now only be two dwellings following discussions and comments received. Mr Nelson said that the dwellings would fit in with the area and he had worked with planning officers to reflect the character of the area. Mr Nelson stated that the development could be successfully assimilated to the area. He said that a turning facility would be introduced. Mr Nelson said that it was clear that refuse vehicles already entered the area and he said that he had visited the site and had seen no issues with this. Mr Nelson said that the construction management plan had been agreed and he had worked with the tree officer on the application. Mr Nelson stated that there were no technical objections to the scheme. He said that the development would create job opportunities during the construction phase. Mr Nelson said that the scheme was well designed. He asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that the development was outside of the development boundary. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh thought the application had come to the committee too soon. He said that the fire service had not yet been consulted and when he looked at the photos, he found it difficult to believe a fire engine would be able to access the area. Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Hudson said that the committee had supported the previous application but had been concerned about further development. He said that the current application was requesting two more houses. Councillor Hudson said that it was important to have a limit.

Councillor Parkinson felt that it was an awkward driveway and that the turning point being added might be an improvement. He said that the committee had approved applications outside of the local plan before. Councillor Parkinson said that all applications should be considered on their own merit. He said that he was initially concerned about the driveway but was happy to propose that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that the proposed site was outside of the development boundary. He said that applications outside of development boundaries kept coming to committee and if they kept being approved, Barnoldby le Beck would get closer and closer to Waltham similar to what had happened with Scartho and Waltham. He said it was important to draw a line. Councillor Lindley said that he would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Hudson stated that the committee did consider each application on its own merit.

Mr Dixon sought clarification on the reasons for refusal of the application. He asked for confirmation that they were the development being outside the development boundary; intrusion into the open countryside; and access and highway safety.

Councillor Dawkins confirmed that it was all of those reasons and another reason he was proposing refusal of the application, was the detrimental effect the development would have on neighbours.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 7 for and 2 against with 1 abstention for the application to be refused.)

Councillor Pettigrew returned to the meeting at this point.

COUNCILLOR PETTIGREW IN THE CHAIR

Item 4 – DM/0838/21/FUL – Land Adjacent to St Lawrences Church, Church Cottage, Church Lane, Greenacre and Field, Church Lane Aylesbury.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that the views expressed on the Councillor call in form were the views of the residents and not his own views. He said that he would consider the application with an open mind as he did with all planning applications.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought change of use of land from agriculture to a learning, growing and sensory garden area. He said that the application had been brought before the planning committee due to call in from a ward councillor. Mr Dixon said that Laceby Parish Council had also raised issues regarding a loss of residential amenity and concerns about noise. Mr Dixon said that the proposed site was located in the open countryside. He said that the application accorded with policy 5 and policy 6 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan as the application was for an outdoor learning area to support children at an existing school and would therefore serve North East Lincolnshire. Mr Dixon stated that the council's heritage officer had not raised any objections to the application. Mr Dixon said that one of the main concerns raised by those objecting to the application was the potential impact on residential amenity. Mr Dixon said that the site would only be used during term time and within school hours and the applicant had sought to limit development on the site to a minimum, with no sheds proposed and any tools, equipment or materials required would be brought from the main school building for each lesson and returned as such afterwards. Mr Dixon said that the raised beds and fencing would be kept to as low a level as possible so as not to attract attention. Mr Dixon stated that the Police's Crime Reduction Officer had not objected to the application. Mr Dixon referred committee members to the supplementary agenda papers where further conditions had been listed

regarding the application. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 66, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of the objector Ms Morrison.

The statement read that her objections to the planning application were on the grounds of loss of privacy, increase in noise (both from the use and upkeep of the area) and potential security issues resulting from the location of the site to the rear of affected properties. Ms Morrison wrote that she was concerned that the area would be developed, then abandoned if the school lost interest after finding it was unable to keep it in the state expected by the village. She wrote that neighbours would be left with a fenced off area within a field that would be open to attracting antisocial behaviour. Ms Morrison wrote that the area was not an area of improved grassland as the application suggested. She wrote that it was an irregular area of rough grass, nettles and thistles next to a pond which was overgrown with nettles, bushes and self set trees. Ms Morrison wrote that the area was of a considerable size for a small school to maintain. Ms Morrison wrote that neighbours had been told the site would only be used only during school hours of 9am to 2.30pm term time. She wrote that she was concerned about how much noise and disturbance to local residents could be created outside of these hours due to the maintenance needed of the area. Ms Morrison wrote that to keep the site viable, it would not be a school hours, term time only project. She wrote that she thought the location was unsuitable. Ms Morrison wrote that a couple of raised beds within the courtyard area of the school would be easier to maintain. She wrote that a sensory garden area that was attractive to look at with both students and staff enjoying it would be a highly maintained feature of the school grounds. Ms Morrison wrote that the Council for Learning Outside the Classroom advocates the creation of gardens within school grounds. She wrote that they suggest the use of community gardens and allotments and that there were allotments close by in Laceby. Ms Morrison wrote that she believed the school attempted using the allotments but were unable to maintain it to the standard required. Ms Morrison wrote that the use of places of worship is also encouraged. She wrote that there was St Lawrence Church opposite the School. Ms Morrison wrote that the proposed site was unsuitable. She wrote that neighbours were concerned about loss of privacy, security, and the noise such an area would create.

Ms Best spoke on behalf of the applicant for the application. She said that the application was for change of use. She said that the school was a special unique school which was a nurturing environment for the students. She said that that nurturing environment allowed for a better education and was more suitable for children with needs where mainstream education doesn't work. Ms Best said that the sensory gardens had been proven to improve concentration levels and offered other benefits. She said that the children who attended the school would enjoy the sensory garden and would receive huge benefits. Ms Best

stated that she supported the planning officer's recommendation of approval. She said that the sensory garden would be in keeping with the area. Ms Best said that the concerns raised by the technical consultees had been overcome. She said that protecting residential amenity had been of importance to her and her colleagues. She said that in order to limit potential crime, they had opted to limit the development on the site. Ms Best stated that the development would not impact the character of the area.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he thought that what was being proposed was an excellent thing to do. He said that the benefit the children get from these facilities was valuable. Councillor Mickleburgh said that the garden would only be used during the term time and within school hours. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that it would be a safe area for children. He seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor Lindley said that he was happy to support the application as he thought the development would be an excellent provision. He said he was sad to see that there had been objections raised. Councillor Lindley said that the children would be well supervised, and that the facility would only be used during term time. He said that the committee should be supporting the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he knew the area well and that whilst he did not want to take anything away from the school, the piece of land was further away from the school than it appeared. He said that he fully supported the views of Councillor Lindley and Councillor Mickleburgh but said that he thought the proposed site was too far away from the school. Councillor Hasthorpe said that he did have sympathy for the neighbours and he did have concerns about the proposed site after people had left the site at the end of the school day. He stated that the proposed site would be a prime target for anti-social behaviour. Councillor Hasthorpe said that he would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Aisthorpe said that she fully supported the application. She said that she did not understand the objections that had been raised. She said that if the proposed site was full of weeds, then it would be best for the school to have a chance to improve this and maintain the site. She had concerns about what would happen to the site if the garden did not work out. She queried whether the site had a fence and whether the site would be put back to how it was if the sensory garden did not work out.

Mr Dixon referred committee members to condition three outlined in the agenda papers.

Councillor Aisthorpe stated that she fully supported the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that the ethos of the plan was highly commendable. He said that ten children would not make much noise and that the facility would only be used during school hours. Councillor Parkinson said that the proposed site had been chosen by the school. He said that any park was subject to potential vandalism. Councillor Parkinson stated that he would support the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that she welcomed the application. She said that there were ten children at the school and she didn't think they would all be using the sensory garden at the same time. Councillor Goodwin said that it was sad to see objections to the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought Councillor Hasthorpe had raised important points. He said he had looked at the site and that there were lots of nettles. Councillor Hudson said that he didn't think the proposed site was the right place. He said he had concerns about the spraying of pesticide close by.

The Chair said that he thought the intentions behind the application were right, but said he agreed with Councillor Hudson regarding the spraying of pesticide close by. The Chair said that he thought the location was not right.

Councillor Lindley said that if the committee applied Councillor Hudson's rationale to all applications that were on the edge of a boundary that was on agricultural land, then the committee would refuse all developments.

Councillor Goodwin said that the school would surely have considered the safety of the children.

The Chair said that he was sure the school would have taken the necessary risk assessments, but he still had concerns. Councillor Hudson said that the school would need to have a strict regime with the farmer in place.

Councillor Parkinson was sure the applicant would liaise with the farmer and not use the site whilst the spraying happened.

The Chair stated that he questioned the suitability of the site and the impact the development would have on the neighbouring amenities.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he knew the area well and did not think the site was appropriate.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 5 - DM/0245/22/FUL – Land South of Diana Princess of Wales Hospital, Scartho Road.

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect twenty nine dwellings with associated highways and landscape works. She explained that the application had been brought before the planning committee due to the number of objections and an objection from Sport England. Ms Jarvis stated that the proposed site was within the development boundary for Grimsby and was allocated for housing. She said that there was an extensive planning history on the site which included previous outline permission for accommodation and retirement living on the site. Ms Jarvis said that the development was for 29 dwellings, and she said they would be predominately bungalows. She said that there would also be features including canopies, chimneys, and timber gable detailing. Ms Jarvis stated that the design of the development would fit in well with the character of the area. Ms Jarvis said that the proposed site was located within flood zone one which was preferable for residential development. She said that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application and had determined that the development would not cause a severe impact on the highway network. Ms Jarvis said that each dwelling would have its own parking space and in some instances a garage. She said that the council's highways officer had recommended conditions to be included regarding construction. Ms Jarvis stated that the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application but had recommended a condition. Ms Jarvis stated that Sports England had objected to the application. She said their objection was regarding the close by cricket pitch and the ball strikes that could occur. She explained that Sports England wanted detail regarding the mitigation fencing which was needed. She said that in the past the issue of ball strike mitigation had been dealt with by a planning condition, but that Sports England now wanted the issue resolved beforehand. Ms Jarvis said that she had emailed Sports England providing them with indicative details, but they had responded saying they still wanted the full detail and they were maintaining their objection to the application. Ms Jarvis said that the applicant had agreed to a section 106 agreement which would be to provide a financial contribution to primary and secondary education, as well as agree to provide 20% affordable housing. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions subject to the finalising of the ball strike mitigation and the signing of a section 106 agreement. Ms Jarvis said that were the committee minded to approve the application, the decision would be delegated to the Assistant Director of Housing and Infrastructure in order to address those outstanding issues.

Councillor Batson said that he was concerned about how busy Sutcliffe Road and Second Avenue had become. He said that the Nunsthorpe Estate was being affected as people were using the estate as they knew how busy Scartho Road was.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that he thought the application was an excellent development. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that he had huge concerns about the application. He said that he shared the concerns of Sports England. Councillor Lindley said that he was concerned about highways and the potential traffic that would feed onto Matthew Telford Park which he said was already getting busier and busier. Councillor Lindley stated that there would be an increase in

traffic. He said that more houses were being built on Scartho Top, and yet there had been no measures put in on Matthew Telford Park such as a crossing or a roundabout. Councillor Lindley said that he had seen nothing that was going to address the issue. He said that he was concerned about the development as a Scartho Ward Councillor, even though the development was located within the Park Ward. Councillor Lindley stated that the report within the agenda papers stated that there would not be a severe impact on the highway network, but he said he disagreed with the statement. He said he was struggling to support the application.

Ms Hattle said that the application was not for an additional 29 dwellings, and instead they were a replacement.

Councillor Aisthorpe said that she agreed with Councillor Lindley and said that she thought highways had not taken into consideration that other developments were happening in the area. She said that the report within the agenda papers mentioned the need to meet housing targets, but she said that might be a one-sided view.

Mr Dixon clarified that the application was not to add dwellings and would instead be a reduction in dwellings to what had previously been approved.

Councillor Aisthorpe thought the application should not have been approved in the first place.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that that went to Scartho a lot and Scartho Road was busy. He said that he thought it was disgraceful that there was no bus service at all for the residents of Scartho Top. Councillor Mickleburgh said that the development had been approved for more dwellings previously and that what was being proposed currently was a reduction. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that his ethos about the application was that it was a lesser development than what had been previously approved. He said that there did need to be another access road to Scartho Top.

Councillor Lindley said that discussions around the access should have taken place a while ago. He said that residents had been let down in that respect. Councillor Lindley stated that he was not adverse to the development but the impact on the highways network was unsustainable.

Councillor Hudson said that the application was for a reduction into what had already been approved. He would support approval of the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions and delegated to the Assistant Director of Housing and Infrastructure for the finalising of the ball strike mitigation and the signing of a section 106 agreement.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for and 4 against with 1 abstention for the application to be approved.)

Councillor Aisthorpe left the meeting at this point.

Item 6 – DM/0123/23/FUL – 3 Beckhythe Close, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought retrospective permission to erect a greenhouse to land at the front of the property. He said that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Dixon stated that the site was located within the development boundary for Grimsby. He said that policy five did not preclude works of this nature in principle within the development boundary. He said that the materials used on the greenhouse were standard materials for a greenhouse. He said that the greenhouse was visible within the street scene but it was not prominent due to the screening in the area from landscaping and its limited size. He said that the greenhouse was small in scale and it was not considered that there had been harm caused to the character of the area. Mr Dixon stated that it was a little unusual for a greenhouse to be across the road from the host property, but that was not a reason to refuse the application. He said that it was considered that there would be no adverse massing, overshadowing or loss of privacy due to the small scale of the greenhouse and where it was positioned. Mr Dixon said that the greenhouse would not unduly harm the amenity of the neighbouring properties. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Miss Pickerden read out a statement on behalf of the applicant Mr Boubly.

Mr Boulby wrote that he wished to apologise to the planning committee for erecting the greenhouse without planning permission. He had not realised that it would be needed. Mr Boulby wrote that appreciated the help that had been given to him by the staff of the planning department. The greenhouse would enable him to continue to be the keen gardener he always had been. Mr Boulby wrote that he hoped the planning committee would feel able to grant the application.

Councillor Shepherd spoke as Ward Councillor for the Scartho Ward. He said that he was speaking on behalf of residents. Councillor Shepherd stated that the application was a retrospective application. He said he had visited the site and met with the objectors. Councillor Shepherd said that he had not had any correspondence from the applicant. He said that the objectors thought that the greenhouse was out of character with the area. Councillor Shepherd said that there had been a lack of communication from the applicant to the other residents. Councillor Shepherd stated that the land registry outlined that no buildings should be on that land. He said that the covenant had been put in place to stop that type of development.

Councillor Parkinson said that he did not think there was a reason to object to the application. He said that the issue regarding the covenant could lead to legal action but that was not a planning issue for the committee to consider. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins said that the greenhouse was an eyesore in the location that it was. He said he was not sure why the applicant had chosen to put it in the front of the property. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he agreed with Councillor Dawkins. He said that there was a covenant on the land. Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that he thought the legal document was vague. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Croft said that she thought it was a shame that the applicant had built the greenhouse without first speaking to the residents. She said that she would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Lindley said that the area was a very nice place to live. He said that whilst putting up the greenhouse might have been a good idea at the time, it did distract from the area. He said that the greenhouse was in the wrong place and he was not sure why the applicant hadn't put the greenhouse in their back garden.

Councillor Goodwin said that she was unsure about the application. She said that she was not sure she would consider the greenhouse to be an outbuilding.

Councillor Hudson said that he personally wouldn't mind his neighbour putting up a greenhouse, but said he understood that it was not to everyone's taste. He said he was unsure about the application.

The committee took a vote on the proposal to approve the application and upon a vote, voted 4 for and 6 against for approving the application.

Mr Dixon sought clarification on the reasons for refusal of the application. He asked for confirmation that the reasons were the development causing a visual intrusion.

Councillor Dawkins confirmed that was the reason for proposing refusal of the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for and 4 against for the application to be refused.)

Item 7 - DM/0303/22/FUL Beacontorpe Methodist Church, Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it sought to convert the existing church into 6 apartments (including mezzanine accommodation to first and second floor) with various internal and external alterations. Ms Jarvis stated that the application had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from the ward councillor. Ms Jarvis said that the existing church was located within flood zone 3 and was therefore at significant risk of flooding. She said that as the application was for a change of use to the site and not a new development, the sequential test was not required. Ms Jarvis stated

however that a flood risk assessment was required which needed to show how the development could be safe. She said that the applicant had submitted a flood risk assessment outlining some methods such as raising floor levels in certain parts of the building and providing refuge areas in the upper floors. Ms Jarvis said, however, that the flood risk assessment was not acceptable as the applicant had not raised all floor heights. She explained that the applicant could not do this without removing or altering significant historical features from the listed building. Ms Jarvis stated that the Environment Agency objected to the application on the grounds of safety to life and property. Ms Jarvis stated that there were also concerns about the conversion in terms of heritage. She said that the conversion would be intrusive and the council's heritage officer was not sure if the conversion was possible. Ms Jarvis said that the council's heritage officer had asked for more detail and had said that at the current stage, substantive harm could not be ruled out. Ms Jarvis stated that at the current stage, planning officers did not consider that there was enough justification for the change of use to take place. She said that alternative less harmful uses of the existing church had not been fully considered. Ms Jarvis stated that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application but had recommended conditions. Ms Jarvis said that despite the positive nature of the scheme which would bring the listed building back into use, there were significant concerns regarding safety and there was a lack of detail provided in how the building would be converted. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Beard spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the two main concerns had been the flood risk and conservation. Mr Beard stated that he had been working on the project for a couple of years and had looked at a number of possibilities in order to address the risk of flooding. He said that the most obvious one would be to raise the floor levels but he said the issue that he had with this was that it would go against the whole reason to do the development in the first place, as raising the floor levels would cause considerable harm to the building. He said that he wanted to preserve the building as much as possible. Mr Beard said that there would be a refuge area in every apartment. He said that he had previously done this on another site with only needing to raise floor levels in some units on that site. Mr Beard said that there would be the Environment Agency's flooding system on the site. Mr Beard stated that regarding conservation, leaving buildings empty can lead to vandalism. He said that there was already some roof damage that had occurred. Mr Beard said that the beauty of the development was that it could be financially viable at this time. He said that regarding design, he had gone with a softer touch.

Councillor Hudson said that Grimsby and Cleethorpes weren't short of empty buildings. He said we had a developer that wanted to save this empty building. Councillor Hudson said that it is great that people wanted to invest.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that there was no shortage of places that have been converted for housing. He said that he was concerned about the flood risk. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh said he wasn't sure there was going to be any other proposals for alternative uses as people in the past had pulled out. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he accepted that there was a flood risk, but he said that other new developments had been approved in the area. He said that he thought the proposal was a good opportunity. Councillor Mickleburgh said that the existing church was on a main road and said he didn't want the building to be vandalised or people to see a vandalised building.

Councillor Croft queried when there had been a flood in the past.

Mr Dixon stated that flood risk was not about the past, but instead about the future. He said that there was a substantial flood risk issue.

Councillor Croft said that she thought it was a great development.

Councillor Dawkins stated that he would be supporting the proposal of approval. He said that flood risk was important to consider but he said you don't go from having zero floods to lots of floods.

Councillor Goodwin said that she thought it was a great application, but she said that she was worried about the proposed rescue points. She said that she had concerns about people being in the flats if there was a flood.

Councillor Lindley said that it was a challenging development. He queried whether it was in the best interests of Cleethorpes to refuse the application. Councillor Lindley said that there wasn't a load of developers ready to snap up the existing church. He said that he fully supported the application.

Councillor Parkinson queried whether every flat had a refuge area.

Ms Jarvis stated that the applicant had said there would be some refuge areas, but she said that even if there was a refuge area in every flat, officers were not convinced that people would be able to get out. She said officers were not convinced that people could be physically rescued or whether people would be safe in the proposed refuge areas.

Councillor Hudson said that there would be refuge areas, but he said people would not sit and wait, they would get out.

Councillor Dawkins said in the past, floods had been a couple of feet high, not 10 feet high.

The committee took a vote on the proposal to refuse the application, and upon a vote, the committee voted 2 for and 8 against refusal.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Mr Dixon said that were the committee minded to approve the application, permission would be granted but would be subject to delegation back to the Assistant Director of Housing and Infrastructure to agree conditions and to check on whether referral to the Secretary of State was required.

Councillor Hudson said that he was concerned about that as it could put a spanner in the works.

Mr Dixon said that this was standard procedure.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved and delegated back to the Assistant Director of Housing and Infrastructure to agree conditions and to check on whether referral to the Secretary of State was required.

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

Councillor Mickleburgh left the meeting at this point.

Item 8 - DM/0304/22/LBC - Beaconthorpe Methodist Church, Grimsby Road, Cleethorpes

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained it sought listed building consent to convert the existing church into 6 apartments (including mezzanine accommodation to first and second floor) with various internal and external alterations (amended plans). Ms Jarvis stated that despite the need to reuse the building, the application would have a significant impact on the heritage of the grade two listed church and the proposed works would be too intrusive. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Councillor Hudson said that the best way to preserve listed buildings was to use them. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

(Note - the committee voted 7 for and 2 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 9 - DM/1090/22/FUL – 36 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought to erect eight detached dwellings with garages and a private road to include widening existing access with associated works. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the planning committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. Mr Dixon said that the proposed site had extant planning permission for six dwellings which had the same access arrangements as to what the new application was proposing. He said that the new application had been submitted by a new applicant. Mr Dixon said that the proposed site was located within the defined development boundary. He said that the application was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon said that the development would not have an undue effect on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties. He said that the application did represent an increase in dwellings by two, but this would not cause the development to be overly dense and that all the dwellings would have a good sized garden, garage and parking area. Mr Dixon said that the design of the dwellings was in keeping with the design of other developments in the Humberston Avenue area and would therefore not harm the visual character of the area. Mr Dixon said that the proposed development would have the same access point as to what was previously agreed. He said that the new application had been considered by the council's highway officer who had determined that there would not be an undue impact on highway safety or amenity. Mr Dixon stated that the council's highway officer had recommended a condition regarding a bin collection point to be included, which he said had been included. Mr Dixon said that the council's tree officer had not objected to the application but had recommended conditions, which he said had been included. He said that the site was located within flood zone one which was preferable for residential development. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had submitted a detailed drainage plan which had been confirmed to be acceptable by the council's drainage officer. Mr Dixon stated that a bat survey must be conducted prior to construction taking place. He said this had been added to the conditions and was required due to the sighting of bats in the area. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the land already had received previous planning permission. He said that the previous design was of a design that would not appeal to some and he would like to change that design. Mr Snowden stated that he had received an award for a development close by. He said each dwelling would have a large garden and that the access would be the same as before. Mr Snowden said that the hedges would be retained and the council's tree officer was supportive of the application. He said that the council's drainage officer was also supportive of the application. Mr Snowden stated that two additional dwellings would not affect the character of the area or the neighbouring properties.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he thought the application was a sensible development. He said that it was more dwellings than originally proposed

but he saw no harm from this. Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley felt that it was not an over intensification of the site. He seconded the proposal of approval.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 10 - DM/0236/23/FUL – 124 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought a variation of condition 2 (approved plans) pursuant to DM/0591/22/FUL (alterations to floor plans and elevations) on the dwelling. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the planning committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. Mr Dixon said that the changes proposed were to amend the shape and openings of the single storey element of the dwellings on the rear elevation. He stated that the changes proposed would not impact neighbouring amenities due to the position of the changes and the separation distance. Mr Dixon said that the proposed changes would not impact highway amenity, drainage or the character of the area. He said that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that it was only a minor change. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dawkins seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

P.89

PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure under delegated powers during the period 17th March – 16th April 2023

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.90 PLANNING APPEALS

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.91 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.92 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 1.25 p.m.