



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 28th September 2023

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th August 2023 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Pettigrew (in the Chair)

Councillors Aisthorpe, Batson, Dawkins (substitute for Croft), Goodwin, Hasthorpe, Hudson, Holland, Lindley, Parkinson and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Jonathan Cadd (Senior Town Planner)
- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Richard Limmer (Senior Town Planner)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)
- Hannah Steer (Solicitor)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor K Swinburn (Immingham Ward Councillor)
- Councillor S Swinburn (Immingham Ward Councillor)

There were 9 members of the public present and one member of the press.

P.17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received for this meeting from Councillor Croft.

P.18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Aisthorpe declared an other registerable interest in P.19 Item 1 as she is a trustee of the Kingsway Club.

Councillor Parkinson declared a pecuniary interest in P.19 Item 1 as he owns property close by.

Councillor Hudson declared a non-registerable interest in P.19 Item 5 as the applicant was a former neighbour of his.

Ms Steer reminded committee members that the applicant for P.19 Item 11 was a ward councillor. She stated that members did not have to declare an interest but were to judge the application based solely on merit.

P.19 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Councillor Aisthorpe and Councillor Parkinson left the meeting at this point.

Item 1 - DM/0355/23/FUL – Kingsway Club, 3 Kingsway, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission to vary condition 2 (Limited Period) and 6 (Hours of Operation) pursuant to DM/0554/21/FUL to extend limited period and increase hours of operation up to 12.00am. Mr Dixon said that at a previous planning committee meeting, the application had been deferred for further discussions to take place regarding concerns raised about the rear beer garden. Mr Dixon stated that at present the upstairs of the premises could already remain open until 12.00am and that the extension of the opening hours would only be for the downstairs. Mr Dixon said it would be considered reasonable to extend the hours of operation by one hour for the downstairs of the premises as this would align the downstairs with the upstairs of the premises in terms of opening hours. Mr Dixon stated that since the previous planning committee meeting when the application was deferred, planning officers and licensing officers had engaged with the applicant to discuss concerns raised regarding the rear beer garden. He said that a management plan had been agreed with the applicant as a result of this which stated that the rear beer garden would not be used as an outside seating area between 9.00pm and 12.00pm the following day. Mr Dixon stated that the management plan had been included as a planning condition. Mr Dixon stated that this was considered to be a betterment of the initial application. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had also engaged with the objectors regarding the application. Mr Dixon stated that the council's environmental health officer had not raised any objection to the management plan. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with the additional conditions.

Mr Oglesby spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that didn't have much more to add as the planning officers had explained the application in detail. Mr Oglesby said that he had had meetings with the

Environmental Team. He said that the extended hour would only be needed on a Friday and Saturday and that every other day of the week, the premises would close no later than 11.00pm.

Councillor Goodwin said that she was pleased to see that everybody had worked together on the application. She queried whether people were still able to use the rear seating area to smoke after the 9.00pm closure.

Mr Oglesby said that he did not allow people to use the area for smoking after 9.00pm.

Councillor Goodwin proposed that the application be approved.

Mr Dixon stated that people would still walk through the rear seating area as it was the access to the building.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought the application had been improved. He commented that he was happy to see his concerns addressed. Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt said that he was happy with the application. He commented that the conditions would need to be enforced otherwise complaints would be made in the future.

The Chair asked who would monitor the management plan.

Mr Dixon said that if the application was approved, the management plan would be a planning condition and would formalise the plan. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had worked with both licensing and planning officers regarding the plan.

Councillor Lindley said that the main consideration with the application was that the Kingsway Club was located in a residential area. He said that he thought the conditions that had been added to the application were appropriate. Councillor Lindley stated that it was important the conditions were enforced. He said that he was happy to support the application providing conditions were adhered to.

Councillor Holland queried whether the impact of passive smoking had been assessed by Environmental Health.

Mr Dixon said that he was unsure whether Environmental Health had assessed the impact of passive smoking, but he said licensing officers had looked at the rear smoking area and were monitoring the situation.

Councillor Goodwin said that the Kingsway Club was a member's club and would not likely be a very noisy place.

The Chair stated that the Kingsway Club was still a bar, so noise had to be considered. He said that he was happy to see that officers and the applicant had worked to resolve the issues. The Chair said that he was happy with the conditions proposed.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 2 – DM/0558/23/FUL – 23 Sterling Crescent, Waltham

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought planning permission to vary condition 2 as granted under DM/0897/22/FUL which would amend the location of the extension, add rooflights to the rear extension and make other minor window changes. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to an objection from Waltham Parish Council. Mr Dixon said that the proposed changes would not cause more of an impact to the area in terms of design. Mr Dixon said that the objection received from Waltham Parish Council was regarding over intensification of the site, but he said that the changes proposed would not increase the size of the already approved development. Mr Dixon said that there had been an objection received from the neighbour at the back of the property citing concern over potential overlooking and a loss of privacy. He said that whilst the changes would mean that the extension would be closer to the property of the neighbour objecting, there would still be a sufficient amount of separation between the two properties. Mr Dixon stated that that the proposed changes would not cause any additional impacts on neighbouring amenities. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that he remembered when the application had previously been heard by the planning committee and the parish council had objected then as well. He said that the application was proposing mild variations that had to be done through no choice of the applicant. Councillor Lindley seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he was surprised to see there was not an objection from the neighbour regarding the roof light. He said as the neighbour had not raised an objection, he was happy to support the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 3 – DM/0573/23/PAT – Land West of Winchester Avenue, Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought prior approval for telecommunications installation of a 15-metre high slim line monopole mast and associated ancillary works. Mr Dixon stated that policy 35 of the local plan outlined the criteria which should be considered regarding telecommunications developments. Mr Dixon said that the policy outlined that applicants must show that the development could not be facilitated on an existing building mast which would cause less visual intrusion or on a site that already contained telecommunications equipment before new sites could be considered. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had said that due to the nature of 5G, more masts were necessary and that other sites had not been considered as there were no other nearby existing sites. Mr Dixon stated that the applicant had also provided information that there was a lack of 5G coverage in the specific area. Mr Dixon said that the proposed location was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon stated that the applicant had provided a statement confirming that the proposal met with International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection standards. Mr Dixon said that the proposed mast would be 15 metres in height and would be green. He said that whilst the mast would be visible on the street scene it would not cause an undue impact on the character of the street scene or wider area. Mr Dixon stated that the council's highways officer had raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon said that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on nearby residential properties in terms of overshadowing, massing or visual intrusion. Mr Dixon stated that objections had been received citing health concerns but said that the applicant had addressed the National Planning Policy Framework requirements regarding health impacts. Mr Dixon stated that it was recommended that prior approval be granted.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he had previously opposed some 5G masts due to location, but he said that he did not personally notice those masts now. He commented that better communications were needed in the area. Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Batson said that he normally would oppose the application but was happy to second the proposal of approval. He said that he did have concerns however about what the equipment would look like in six months' time as the equipment did get damaged.

Councillor Hudson said that 5G masts were part of the street scene now. He said that he was happy to approve the application.

Councillor Dawkins stated that no residents had objected to the application and that he therefore was happy to support approval of the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he found it difficult to find grounds to refuse the application. He said that he would support the application but agreed with Councillor Batson about concerns regarding vandalism of the masts and the accompanying cabinets.

Councillor Goodwin said that she agreed with Councillor Batson about potential vandalism. She said that she also agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe as she also did not notice the masts.

Councillor Parkinson queried why the newer masts tended to be thinner whilst the older ones tended to be chunkier and had larger cabinets.

Mr Dixon said that the newer ones were better and did tend to be not as chunky.

Councillor Parkinson asked whether the masts were painted green.

Mr Cadd said that the masts were powder coated green when they were installed.

Councillor Shutt said that he agreed with his fellow councillors. He said that there were objections citing concerns, but he said that there were 5G specific commissions which provide guidance.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

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

Item 4 – DM/0597/23/PAT – Land Outside of Old Lindsey Hall Nursing Home, Clee Road, Cleethorpes

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought prior approval for a 15-metre monopole telecommunications mast with associated cabinets and ancillary development. Mr Dixon said that the application had been brought before the committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Dixon stated that policy 35 of the local plan outlined the criteria which should be considered regarding telecommunications developments. Mr Dixon said that the policy outlined that applicants must show that the development could not be facilitated on an existing building mast which would cause less visual intrusion or on a site that already contained telecommunications equipment before new sites could be considered. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had stated that due to the nature of 5G, a greater number of masts were needed and there were no sites nearby which would provide the necessary technical requirements for the proposed mast. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed location was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon stated that the applicant had provided a statement confirming that the proposal met with International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection standards. Mr Dixon said that the mast would be 15 metres in height and would be green. He said that objections citing concerns over

impact to the character of the area had been received. Mr Dixon explained that the mast would be located on a main road where there were also streetlights. He said that the mast would be sufficiently separated from the care home. Mr Dixon said that the mast would be visible on the street scene but would not detract from the character of the area. Mr Dixon stated that the council's highways officer had not objected to the application. Mr Dixon said that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on nearby residential properties in terms of overshadowing, massing or visual intrusion. Mr Dixon stated that objections had been received citing health concerns but the applicant had addressed the National Planning Policy Framework requirements regarding health impacts. He said that concerns had also been raised within the objections regarding the impact on existing trees. Mr Dixon explained that the trees were not protected trees and he said that the council's trees and woodlands officer had raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon stated that it was recommended that prior approval be granted.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that better communications were needed in the local area. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Holland queried what discussions had taken place between planning officers and the applicant.

Mr Dixon said that there was a pre-application advice service, but the applicant had chosen not to utilise the service available.

Councillor Shutt said that he was not sure the health concerns cited were necessarily planning considerations, but he said that lots of work had clearly gone into raising the objections.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

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

Councillor Hudson left the meeting at this point.

Item 5 - DM/0324/23/FULA – 21 Church Lane Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought permission to make various alterations and extensions to include two storey rear extensions, a first-floor side extension with car port below, a two-storey extension to the side and a two-storey extension to the front. Mr Dixon said that the application also sought permission for a loft conversion with roof lights, alterations to the roof, alterations to the driveway and new landscaping to the front and side boundary. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. Mr Dixon said that

there had also been some objections raised by neighbours. Mr Dixon said that the site was located within the development boundary of Humberston and was acceptable in principle. Mr Dixon said that the majority of the works proposed would be to the rear and side of the property. He said that the property was a little bit unusual, and the design proposed did seek to respond to that. Mr Dixon stated that the width of the property would increase due to the side extensions and the length of the property would increase due to the extensions to the rear and the addition of a front bay window. Mr Dixon said that the proposed works would be considered to be in keeping with the character of the area and would not be considered to be an over intensification in terms of design. Mr Dixon stated that the applicant had provided a heritage statement due to the site being located adjacent to the Humberston Conservation Area and the council's heritage officer had raised no objections to the application. He said that the neighbours had cited concerns about the two-storey side extension and the rear extensions. Mr Dixon explained that the two-storey side extension would bring the property closer to the neighbours to the west, but the extension would not exceed the height of the existing property and would not cause an adverse impact in terms of massing and overshadowing. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed side window would be obscured to avoid any loss of privacy. Mr Dixon stated that the neighbours had also raised concerns regarding the removal of hedges, though in this case this was not considered adverse. Mr Dixon stated that the council's highways officer had recommended a condition regarding a construction traffic management plan, which had been subsequently included with the application. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had submitted a sustainable drainage strategy which had been deemed acceptable by the council's drainage officer. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Scoffin spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the property was adjacent to the Humberston Conservation Area. Mr Scoffin stated that the majority of works would be to the rear and side of the property. He said that the width of the property would increase and that the proposals would follow the original design with steep sloped roofs. Mr Scoffin stated that the existing house was located within a large residential plot and that the proposed extensions would be in keeping with the existing house and in scale with the plot. He said that although the property did seem large, it was quite small. Mr Scoffin commented that a sustainable drainage plan had been submitted and reviewed by officers and was deemed to be acceptable. He said a light assessment had been carried out at the request of the planning officers and had been deemed acceptable. Mr Scoffin said that in terms of loss of sunlight, the proposed extensions would have little effect and he said that there was already overshadowing caused by the existing house.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that a huge amount of work had gone into the development. He said that all of the objections allude to dominance and

that after looking at the photos, he agreed with the objectors. Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Dawkins said that he had concerns about dominance. He said that the property was located within his ward and that the proposed changes would make the property larger. He seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Aisthorpe stated that she was unsure about the application. She queried whether the proposed extension would be in line with the neighbour's extension.

The Chair said that the difference between the two extensions was that the one being proposed would be two-storey.

Councillor Aisthorpe queried the concerns raised by those objecting about the ground.

The Chair stated that ground concerns would be for the builder to consider and was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor Lindley said that it was a huge extension. He said that he thought that as the extension was two-storey, it would overshadow neighbours at number twenty-three. Councillor Lindley said that he did not think it was appropriate. He said that he would support refusal of the application.

Councillor Shutt commented that he found the application challenging. He said that he understood the concerns raised over size. Councillor Shutt queried whether the concerns raised about hedges were planning considerations.

Mr Dixon stated that it would depend on the circumstances. He said that in this particular case, the objections regarding hedges were a private issue.

Councillor Hasthorpe stated that if the plot was wider, he would not have had any issue with the application. He said that he thought the application would lead to over intensification of the plot.

Councillor Aisthorpe said that she was inclined to agree with Councillor Hasthorpe. She queried how much difference it would make the extension not being single storey.

Mr Dixon said that the committee need to consider whether there would be a detrimental impact.

Councillor Parkinson said that he liked the aesthetics of the design, but he said he thought the extension was a bit to far. He commented that he thought the plot was too narrow for the development that had been proposed.

Councillor Dawkins said that he thought the side extensions were a concern. He said that he thought the extensions were not acceptable.

Mr Dixon sought clarification on the reasons the motion of refusal had been proposed.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he had proposed refusal for reasons of over intensification, dominance, and a detrimental impact on neighbours.

Councillor Dawkins agreed to the reasons stated by Councillor Hasthorpe.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 5 for and 4 against with 1 abstention for the application to be refused.)

Councillor Hudson returned to the meeting at this point.

Item 6 - DM/0152/23/FUL – Mariners Service Station, 196 Waltham Road, Grimsby

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it sought permission to install five electric vehicle charging points with canopy, lighting, an associated substation and enclosure. Mr Cadd said that as part of the application, an existing detached car wash and facilities building would be demolished. Mr Cadd said that the application had been brought before the committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Cadd stated that the petrol station was an existing facility within the development boundary for Grimsby. He said that the development was acceptable in principle. Mr Cadd referred committee members to the supplementary papers for the application which outlined the need for the electric vehicle chargers and that existing stations were viewed as good locations for them as people already visited the locations for their cars. Mr Cadd said that the main objection to the application was the potential impact on neighbouring amenities. He said that the objections cited concerns over noise and an increase in activity at the site. Mr Cadd explained that there had been discussions with the applicant following the concerns raised which resulted in a reduced scheme, from eight electric vehicle chargers to five and he said they had been moved away from the boundary. Mr Cadd said that the substation also had been moved from the frontage to address visual amenity concerns. He also said that the noise concerns cited about the new jet wash booths had resulted in them being removed from the scheme. Mr Cadd said that the introduction of electric vehicles chargers would cause some nuisance, but this would be limited during the day as the other facilities at the petrol station would be in operation. Mr Cadd said that the applicant had provided an acoustic survey which showed that the noise levels for nearby residential properties would be low between the hours 11:00pm – 6:00am. However, having the facility open would

create noise from doors opening and closing and could also lead to people using the location to meet up. He said that, with that in mind, it had been conditioned that the new facilities only be operational during the same time as the petrol station and not 24 hours as originally planned. Mr Cadd said that there would be some lighting left on at the site but that this would be mainly screened by the boundary wall and fences, reducing the impact on neighbours. He said that there would also be a canopy and rear screen for the electric vehicle charging points which would further reduce the impact of the lighting. Mr Cadd stated that there had also been concerns raised regarding anti-social behaviour. He said that the applicant would introduce a management plan which would seek to reduce the impacts on neighbours as well install CCTV to cover the new development. Mr Cadd said that this would discourage people from loitering in the area. Mr Cadd said that the visual impact on neighbours would be lessened as the majority of the current landscaping on the site would remain including fences and a hedge. He said that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. Mr Cadd said that there had been no objection raised from the council's highways officer regarding the application. Mr Cadd stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 6, 22, 34, 36 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Dawkins said that he thought it was fantastic that electric vehicle chargers were being installed. He said that a car wash could potentially be noisier than the chargers and that whilst there would be some noise from the fan, he didn't think it would be as noisy as the current car wash. Councillor Dawkins proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that a jet wash would be noisier. He said that infrastructure for electric cars was needed. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he was concerned about the proposed location as the proposed site was located in a residential area. He commented that usually electric vehicle chargers were installed near shopping centres. Councillor Lindley said that he questioned whether the facility would be used due to the proposed location. He said that he also had concerns about lighting and the impact on neighbours. Councillor Lindley stated that he was not sure who the application was targeted at. He said that he understood the need for the chargers at certain locations but was not sure the proposed location was the right location for them. Councillor Lindley commented that residents in Scartho that had electric cars would use their own electric vehicle charger at their home and he did not see the residents using the proposed chargers. He stated that he would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that the electric vehicle chargers being proposed would be better than home ones. He said that the proposed

chargers would power an electric vehicle for 120 miles after a 15-minute charge. Councillor Dawkins said that people visiting the area would use the chargers.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he disagreed with Councillor Lindley. He commented that the petrol station had been at the location for a long time and that the lighting would be no different. He said that he thought the electric vehicle chargers would be useful for visitors.

Councillor Aisthorpe stated that she agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe that the chargers would be ideal for visitors in the area. She said that the application also supported the council's green agenda.

Councillor Shutt said that the UK was far behind on electric car charging infrastructure. He commented that he thought the existing car wash must make more noise than electric vehicle charging points. Councillor Shutt said that he was minded to support the application.

Councillor Hudson said that the applicant would have conducted research into whether there was a need for the chargers in the specific area.

Councillor Parkinson said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson that the applicant would not be going ahead with the application if it was not viable. He said that whilst some people would have home chargers, the ones being installed would be quicker. Councillor Parkinson commented that he could not see there being any noise issues. He queried whether a condition could be added to address lighting concerns.

Mr Cadd referred committee members to their agenda papers and outlined condition 2 and condition 3 included with the application.

The Chair queried whether a condition needed to be considered to deal with any anti-social behaviour concerns.

Mr Cadd stated that Humberside Police had requested a condition and the applicant had agreed to the condition.

Mr Dixon said that a specific condition about lighting could be added.

Councillor Hasthorpe referred committee members to condition 4 outlined in the agenda papers. He said that he thought condition 4 would cover the issue of lighting.

Councillor Holland said that he could not see any issue with the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that the committee should not focus on the business case and should instead focus on planning considerations. He reiterated that the electric vehicle chargers being proposed were twenty times faster than at home electric vehicle chargers.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he thought the application had lots of positive aspects to it.

Councillor Goodwin said that she thought the application was a no brainer. She commented that she hoped other petrol stations would follow suit. Councillor Goodwin stated that she would support the application.

Councillor Lindley said that he stood by his original view. He said that the chargers being at the rear of the site would create problems. Councillor Lindley commented that he thought there was potential for anti-social behaviour and lighting issues.

Councillor Shutt commented that the applicant had listened and had adapted by accepting the conditions outlined in the report.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 7 - DM/0508/23/OUT – Land off Habrough Road Immingham

Mr Cadd introduced the outline application and explained that it sought permission for the erection of seven bungalows with all matters reserved. Mr Cadd said that the application had been brought before the committee due to a call in from the Ward Councillor. He said that an objection from Immingham Town Council and various neighbours had been received. Mr Cadd said that the applicant had provided an indicative plan. Mr Cadd stated that the proposed site was located within open countryside and that policies 3 and 4 of the local plan did not justify allowing general housing in the open countryside. Mr Cadd said that the tilted balance did not come into effect as the council could demonstrate a 5-year housing supply, therefore no additional housing was required. He said that in exceptional circumstances, development could be allowed within the open countryside, but that it had been determined that there were no exceptional circumstances to support the application. Mr Cadd said that the site was also considered to be unsustainable as it was located 600m away from the edge of the development area of Immingham and around 2km away from the Kennedy Way Shopping Centre. He said that whilst there was a footpath that linked the site to Immingham, large parts of it were unlit, narrow and next to a 60mph road. Mr Cadd said that it was certainly not ideal for people to walk on to get to the facilities. He also said that whilst there was a bus stop, no service buses used the route. Mr Cadd said that the provisions available were not acceptable and would not meet the standard required to be considered sustainable. Mr Cadd said that whilst the materials proposed to be used such as Hempcrete would bring a positive benefit to the scheme, it would not outweigh the unsustainability and issues of the

location. Mr Cadd stated that the council's highways officer and the council's drainage officer had not objected to the application but had required conditions be added. Mr Cadd stated that he had received an objection from Harbour Energy regarding the application and the potential harm it could cause to the Viking Carbon Capture and Storage Pipeline project. He said that their objection to the application cited the difficulty it could cause to the operation of the pipeline and the necessary maintenance. Mr Cadd said that whilst the benefits of the scheme had been noted, the issue of principle, character and sustainability remained as well as the issue around the pipeline. Mr Cadd stated that the application was not in accordance with policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 22, 36 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mrs Midgley spoke as the developer of the site. She said that she disagreed with the term open countryside being used in regard to the site as there were sporadic houses close by. Mrs Midgley stated that the application was proposing something similar. She said that she was proposing 5-7 bungalows which would be wheelchair friendly and would be made with sustainable materials. Mrs Midgley stated that she had spoken to the solicitor of the company involved with the pipeline and had agreed that there would only be 5 built in order to avoid any issues with the pipeline. Mrs Midgley said that the material Hempcrete would be used and that all of the bungalows would have solar. She stated that the type of bungalows being built were bungalows of the future. Mrs Midgley said that one of the main reasons they were wanting to build on the specific land was as they could not afford to buy land elsewhere. She said that one of the main objectives was to create affordable bungalows. Mrs Midgley stated that three local people had already signed up for the bungalows. She said that the bungalows would be fairly close to local facilities, 11 minutes from the local pub and 19 minutes from the Civic Centre. Mrs Midgley said that this would be no different to other villages. She stated that there was a dial a ride bus service available in the area. Mrs Midgley stated that the application was not contrary to policy 16. She said that the proposed bungalows would set the bar much higher for new builds in the local area and would be a landmark pilot. Mrs Midgley said that she would be able to build further developments in future once funds from the bungalows were attained.

Councillor S Swinburn spoke as a ward councillor for the Immingham Ward. He said that the Hempcrete material proposed to be used would fit in with the council's green agenda. Councillor Swinburn said that there would be a dial a ride service for residents to use. He said that there had been no objection from the council's highways officer regarding the development. Councillor Swinburn stated that the applicant was willing to build 5 dwellings rather than 7 so as not to affect the pipeline. Councillor Swinburn stated that the application had been considered acceptable in terms of residential amenities and had not been objected to by the council's ecology officer and drainage officer. He asked members to grasp the opportunity the development would bring. Councillor Swinburn said that committee members should

undertake a site visit and see the site for themselves. He asked members to consider the council's green agenda.

Councillor Dawkins said that he liked the idea about the bungalows. However, he said that the site was not in the local plan and that he did not want to go against the local plan. Councillor Dawkins said that he was not sure whether that would change in the future. He commented that it was unfortunate as he liked the idea of the bungalows. Councillor Dawkins proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he applauded the idea but he said that the town council was against the application and the site was not in the local plan. He commented that he thought the land should be left as it was. Councillor Hasthorpe seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Lindley said that whilst he thought the presentation had been fantastic, the site was still outside of the local plan, and he had to be consistent. He said that he found it sad to refuse an application of this nature, but he had to be consistent. Councillor Lindley stated that he would be supporting refusal of the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he was cynical when he first heard about building near the pipeline. He said that he was not sure why the two proposed bungalows near the pipeline had not been removed.

Councillor Goodwin said that she would be supporting the application and that she thought the presentation about the application had been excellent. Councillor Goodwin stated that the ward councillor knew his Ward. She said that she thought based on what the developer had said that the two proposed bungalows near the pipeline would be removed from the plans.

The Chair stated that was new information and that the committee had to consider the application as it was.

Councillor Goodwin said that the local plan was up for review and that the site could potentially be included. She said that she thought the idea was excellent and that the council should work with the applicant and show that we were a listening council. Councillor Goodwin stated that the applicant was willing to reduce the number of bungalows from 7 to 5.

The Chair reiterated that the committee needed to consider the application as it was.

Councillor Aisthorpe said that the area was in need of these types of developments. She said that it was only a small development. Councillor Aisthorpe said that there was the issue of the pipeline. She said that she thought it would be worth deferring the application to allow the applicant to resubmit the application with the pipeline in mind. Councillor Aisthorpe stated that the council should work with the applicant.

Councillor Parkinson said that it was a plan of great quality. He said that he thought the positives outweighed the downsides. Councillor Parkinson commented that the developer had said she was happy to remove two of the bungalows.

Councillor Shutt said that he thought it was an interesting debate. He said that he thought the application needed more time, but that it sounded like it could work.

Councillor Lindley said he understood what Councillor Parkinson was saying but he said the committee had been fairly consistent in regard to applications outside of the local plan. Councillor Lindley stated that he stood by his decision, albeit reluctantly as it was a good development being proposed.

Councillor Holland said that he agreed with Councillor Lindley. He said that the site could be considered when the local plan was reviewed.

Councillor Aisthorpe said that she thought it was important for the committee to be open minded.

Councillor Goodwin said that the landowner wanted the development to work. She commented that she thought it was a good use for the land.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that the application was for 7 bungalows. He said that the committee should focus on the current application.

Councillor Hudson said that he agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe. He said that two of the bungalows were where the pipeline would be.

Councillor Parkinson said that the committee did follow the local plan but could deviate in exceptional circumstances.

Mr Dixon said that the site was well divorced from any settlement and even with a housing supply issue it did not necessarily mean officers would recommend approval. Mr Dixon stated that in order to justify going against the local plan, there needed to be exceptional circumstances and in this instance this justification had not been proven.

RESOLVED – That the application to be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for and 5 against for the application to be refused.)

Item 8 - DM/0444/23/OUT – 153 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the outline application and explained that it sought permission to erect three detached dwellings to the rear of 153 Humberston Avenue, with access to be considered. He said that the

application had been approved by the committee before but that the permission had lapsed. Mr Dixon stated that the application was before the committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council due to the back land development and the impact on the character of the area. He said that a further objection had been received by a neighbour. Mr Dixon stated that the site was located within the development boundary for Humberston. Mr Dixon said that the current application was a repeat of the scheme that had been approved. He said that the applicant had submitted an indicative plan which showed that three dwellings could be accommodated onto the site without causing undue impacts to the neighbouring properties. Mr Dixon said that it was considered that the development would not harm the character of the area as back land and infill development had become an intrinsic part of the character of Humberston Avenue. He also said that the proposed dual access was not unusual for the street scene. Mr Dixon said that the council's trees and woodlands officer had not objected to the application but had requested that the condition relating to the eastern boundary be added as this was included with the previous application. Mr Dixon stated that the council's highways officer was happy with the plans for the access but had requested conditions be added. He also stated that a condition had been added requiring a sustainable surface water drainage scheme be submitted at the request of the council's drainage officer. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 38 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that permission had recently lapsed. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that the outline application was approved in 2019 and that since then more back land development had occurred on Humberston Avenue. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson said that the committee had approved the application before, but he thought that it was due to the housing supply. He said that he would have been happier with the application if it was for one dwelling rather than three.

Councillor Shutt queried why the planning permission lapsed.

The Chair said that the planning permission had expired, and the applicant had re-submitted the application which they are allowed to do.

Councillor Shutt queried why the work had not been done when they had the planning permission.

Mr Dixon said that he thought it was for personal reasons, but he said that the committee needed to focus on the application and determine it based on its merits.

Councillor Shutt asked whether the proposed dwellings were the same. Mr Dixon stated that they were.

Councillor Dawkins said that planning history dated back to 2015. He said that he did not think it mattered what had happened before and that the committee should consider the current application. Councillor Dawkins said that he would support the view of the Humberston Village Council.

Councillor Aisthorpe stated that she agreed with Councillor Dawkins. She said that she did not think the development would fit in with the area. She commented that she would support the Humberston Village Council.

Councillor Parkinson said that back land development had changed the area. He said that he did not particularly support putting three dwellings in the back garden. Councillor Parkinson said that he did not think the committee could refuse the application as it would probably be allowed at appeal.

Councillor Holland said that he agreed with Councillor Dawkins and Councillor Aisthorpe.

Councillor Lindley said that three dwellings were the personal preference of the applicant. He said that Humberston Avenue had seen significant developments and that the development was not unusual. Councillor Lindley said that the committee had previously supported back land developments and that they had not had any guidance to say how many could be built in the area. He said that whilst the development might not be to everyone's liking, it was difficult to refuse in terms of planning considerations. Councillor Lindley stated that he stood by his support for the application.

Councillor Goodwin said that she agreed with Councillor Lindley. She said that she did not think the committee could change their minds and she said the committee had approved similar developments. Councillor Goodwin commented that she did not think the developments had changed the character of the area. She said that she would be supporting approval of the application.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that the committee had to consider the application in front of them.

Councillor Hudson said that he would not be supporting the application. He said that the Parish Council had been consistent in their objection to the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that there had been lots of development in the Humberston area and that it was important to consider the availability of school places and doctors in the area. He said that he would be voting against the application.

RESOLVED – That the application to be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for and 5 against for the application to be approved.)

Item 9 - DM/01690/22/FULA- 182 Humberston Fitties, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained it sought permission to demolish an existing conservatory, erect a single storey rear extension with cladding, install decking with an access ramp to the side and make various associated alterations. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. Mr Dixon stated that the development was acceptable in principle as long it would not have a detrimental impact. Mr Dixon stated that a lot of negotiations had taken place with the applicant. He said that the result of these negotiations was that the overall footprint of the chalet would remain the same, with the exception of the accessibility ramp and the decking. Mr Dixon explained that this meant that the proposed new extension would be the same size as the existing one. Mr Dixon stated that the council's heritage officer had not objected to the application once the applicant had agreed to the changes. Mr Dixon said that the existing metal sheeting contained asbestos, and that the applicant had been reminded of their duties under the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012. Mr Dixon said that the applicant had proposed that the existing external metal sheeting would be clad over in timber and that the original sheeting would not be removed. Mr Dixon stated that the use of timber cladding was considered appropriate in the Humberston Fitties Chalet Design Guide. Mr Dixon stated that the proposed design was acceptable. Mr Dixon said that the proposal would not cause any detrimental impact on neighbouring amenities. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 12, 22, 33, 34 and 39 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that the changes were being made for mobility reasons. He commented that he was pleased to see the front remain the same. Councillor Hasthorpe said that he saw no reason to object to the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley said that he was pleased to see an application being submitted prior to any work being undertaken. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Dawkins commented that he would be supporting the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 10 – DM/0137/23/FULA – 2 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought permission to erect a single storey home gym with associated works. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to the number of objections received. Mr Dixon said that the site was located within the development boundary of Humberston and that policy 5 did not preclude the types of works proposed. Mr Dixon said that the outbuilding would be located at the south-west corner of the rear garden of the property. He said that the materials used for the outbuilding would be the same as the materials for the existing host property. Mr Dixon said that the proposed plot was capable of accommodating the addition of an outbuilding of the size and scale proposed. Mr Dixon stated that the outbuilding would be screened by existing trees and hedges and would not be detrimental to the character of the area. He said that the design of the outbuilding was acceptable. Mr Dixon stated that the objections received cited concerns over use of the outbuilding and the construction phase. Mr Dixon said that a condition had been included with the application which outlined that the outbuilding remain ancillary to the host property. Mr Dixon said that the agent for the application had confirmed that all construction access would be from the sole access point to the property from Humberston Avenue. Mr Dixon said that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenities. He said that the council's trees and woodlands officer had raised no objections to the application. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5, 22, 34 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was therefore recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he was pleased to see an occupancy condition included. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

Item 11 - DM/0530/23/FUL – Flat 5, 1- 5 Corporation Road Grimsby

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it sought retrospective permission to erect a first-floor side extension with associated internal and external works. Mr Dixon stated that the application had been brought before the committee due to the applicant being a ward councillor. Mr Dixon said that the site was located within

the development area of Grimsby. He said that the scheme had been amended to what was previously approved. Mr Dixon stated that all of the works had been completed. Mr Dixon said that as the extension was to the side of the building, it was therefore not considered to have had a significant impact on the street scene. He said that the extension had been constructed of grey PVC cladding and had a flat roof. Mr Dixon said that the extension was of an acceptable size and scale. Mr Dixon stated that in terms of impact, the works had not created a significant impact on neighbours due to the position of the building in an already established area of commercial businesses and an already established use. Mr Dixon said that the building now had a more consistent appearance and fitted in more with an industrial setting. He said that there had been no objections raised regarding the application. Mr Dixon stated that the application was in accordance with policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan and was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hasthorpe said that he thought it was a shame the application had been brought before the committee retrospectively. He said that he saw no reason to object to the application. Councillor Hasthorpe proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Lindley stated that he agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe about the application being before committee retrospectively. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Shutt commented that he agreed with Councillor Hasthorpe and Councillor Lindley.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

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

P.20 LOCAL IMPACT REPORT

The committee received a report from the Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Infrastructure regarding the Immingham Eastern Roll On Roll Off Terminal development. Mr Limmer introduced the report and committee members were given the opportunity to ask questions and seek clarification on any matters.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.21 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 30th June – 26th July 2023.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.22 PLANNING APPEALS

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

Mr Dixon reminded committee members of the upcoming planning appeal hearing regarding DM/0285/22/FUL. He stated that Councillor Hasthorpe would be attending and speaking on behalf of the Planning Committee.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.23 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.24 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 1.00pm.