

Megan Green (Engie)

From: Waltham Parish Council <walthampc@btconnect.com>
Sent: 17 November 2021 10:18
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: Waltham Parish Council Planning Comment

Good morning,

Please may I submit the following comment on behalf of Waltham Parish Council.

Planning Application Reference: DM/1112/21/FUL Proposal: Erect extension to front to include first floor rooms in roof space, erect single storey store extension to side, convert existing roof space and install dormer to side with various alterations Location: 18 Lytham Drive Waltham North East Lincolnshire DN37 0DG

Waltham Parish Council recommends refusal of this application on the following grounds. The Parish Council note the changes made since the previous application. The Parish Council's view is that the dimensions of the proposed extension are too large for the location and therefore an overdevelopment of the site. The development is not in keeping with the character of the properties in the immediate area and would have a detrimental impact upon the streetscene. The Parish Council notes resident concerns over loss of residential amenity.

Kind Regards

Tanya

Tanya Kuzemczak
 Clerk to the Parish Council

Tel: 01472 826233

Waltham Parish Council
 Parish Office
 Kirkgate Car Park
 Kirkgate, Waltham
 Grimsby
 North East Lincolnshire,
 DN37 0LS
www.walthamparishcouncil.org.uk

The information in this message including any attachments may be confidential or privileged and is for the use of the named recipient only. If you are not the named or intended recipient you may not copy, distribute, or deliver this message to anyone or take any action in reliance on it. If you receive this message in error please contact Waltham Parish Council immediately by email or telephone 01472 826233 and delete it from your system.

Scanned by Anti Virus Software.

From: Betty Green

Sent: 25 November 2021 10:36

To: Bethany Loring (Engie) <Bethany.Loring@nelincs.gov.uk>

Subject: DM/1112/21/FUL

WE ARE OBJECTING to planning application DM/1112/21/FUL - proposed erect 3.2 metre extension to front to include first floor rooms in roof space; erect single storey store extension to side; convert existing roof space and install dormer to side at 18 Lytham Drive Waltham Grimsby. We note on the new plans that sizes and design on the proposed frontage and the dormer are the same as the previous application. There is a change in the design of the dormer, mainly interior, but the size remains the same.

We are neighbours at 9 Lytham Drive Waltham living in a ground floor bungalow and have lived there for over 18 years.

We wish to object to the above application on the following grounds:

- 1). Loss of amenity/ privacy
- 2). Impact the front extension in particular will have on our lives
- 3). Out of character in appearance compared with existing properties in the area.

EXPLANATION: 1) Loss of amenity/privacy: The proposed 3.2 metre extension to the front of the property will result in a loss of privacy as the first floor bedroom window already looks straight into our lounge window.

2). Impact on our lives: We have had concerns about privacy from this bedroom window since it was installed - before the applicant moved in. If the proposed extension is brought forward another 3.2 metres it will encroach even more into our privacy.

3). Out of character: Properties in this area are ground floor bungalows. No 18 is the only one with a converted roof space and with a front facing window.

We consider the front extension and the proposed dormer to be an over development . It will not blend in with the rest of the properties not only in the vicinity of the cul-de-sac but with bungalows in Lytham Drive therefore will be out of character and detrimental to the street scene.

Mr F and Mrs B Green

9 Lytham Drive

Waltham

DN370DG

Comments for Planning Application DM/1112/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1112/21/FUL

Address: 18 Lytham Drive Waltham North East Lincolnshire DN37 0DG

Proposal: Erect extension to front to include first floor rooms in roof space, erect single storey store extension to side, convert existing roof space and install dormer to side with various alterations

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mr Barry Coultas

Address: 11 Lytham Drive Waltham Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I reiterate previous comments, from the initial application. The extension to the front will dominate and appear out of character with the nature of the picturesque close.

Bethany Loring (Engie)

From: Lorraine Johnson
Sent: 28 November 2021 17:34
To: Bethany Loring (Engie)
Subject: DM/1112/21/FUL

IN RESPONSE to the HA Design Studio Design Statement regarding extensions to 18 Lytham Drive, Waltham DM/1112/21/FUL, we wish to make the following comments:

Firstly we respectfully point out that this is not a supplementary statement to the new application but a replica of the previous design statement apart from one slight adjustment and some misleading information.

The new application shows there are no changes to the previous plans to affect the front of the property and therefore none either to the street scene.

We dispute the plans will not dominate its surroundings. We point out the front extensions to the side of our property at 19 Lytham Drive will only be 0.96metres from our boundary, not taking into account the walkway which will sit on the boundary. The distance between No 18 and No 17 boundaries will be even less at 0.4metres resulting in the front extension more or less stretching from one boundary to the other.

We point out that while No 18 is at the moment stepped back from our property, the proposed 3.2metre front extension will protrude past our garage wall by 1.6metres to cover a sitting room/office window. The bedroom window of the extension will line up with our sitting room window. The walkway will sit on the boundary. It will be overbearing and intrusive and will therefore threaten our Right of Light and Amenity.

Referring to the two dormer extensions in Lytham Drive – No 16 is a side dormer overlooking a public walkway leading to Elsham Drive, therefore it does not pose a threat to any neighbouring property's privacy, daylight or sunlight. No 22 is smaller in size to the proposed 5.9metre dormer. It is built over the side driveway and away from the neighbouring property and does not overshadow it or block a window.

While we note there is no change to the ridge height to No18, we respectfully suggest that this application illustrates more how much a detrimental impact the proposed plans will have on the street scene.

We also point out No 18 is the only bungalow along Chestnut Road leading into Lytham Drive with a loft conversion with a front facing window and two windows overlooking the back garden,.

We also strongly dispute that the extensions will not have any impact on daylight and sunlight and we refer to our Right of Light, acquired under the Prescription Act 1832. .

Under the Act, a Right of Light usually occurs once light has been enjoyed through designed apertures of a building for an uninterrupted period of 20 years. Our bungalow was constructed in the Seventies and it applies to any habitable room no matter how small.

We also draw attention to Residential Amenity - which we point out also has a significant and valuable impact on the way in which people use their homes. The health and well-being of residents is often viewed as being directly related to the level of residential amenity occupants can enjoy.

We feel this should also be considered when the application is studied by the Planners and the Planning Committee, as we maintain it will be an intrusive over development which will rob us of that well-being.

The Report gives the impression the dormer will provide an additional bedroom and bathroom to the property. No 18 already has four bedrooms and we note on the plans that the new dormer bedroom will be smaller but also will

result in the loss of a larger downstairs bedroom to be replaced with a sunken seating area. Thus, overall there will be a loss of bedroom space for the family and the property will still remain with four bedrooms, one downstairs and three in the loft conversion and dormer,

We also note the design of the dormer has been changed to what appears to be an area that juts out at the side but we point out there is no change to the overall length of 5.9metres. The dormer depth remains the same at 3.7metres at the front and will still overhang and overlook our private back garden and seating area by 2.2metres. As there is less only 0.6metres between the two boundaries it will be intrusive and result in a loss of Amenity.

There is at the moment only a tunnel of daylight and sunlight channelled into our back garden. Together, the extended front extension and dormer will channel even less sunlight into the back garden. In the Report it was described as 'a box-style dormer – and that is what it is – a box on the roof with a chunk added on.

The Report states there will be a front entrance which will limit the need to use the back door on the existing side extension which only serves the kitchen area. It is proposed to block off this side pathway so it cannot be used for access to the rear garden. What if the applicant in the future or new owners open up the access to the rear garden?

We note that the Report states that the applicant is offering to install a privacy screen of our choice. While we acknowledge this offer in this new application, we point out that the applicant has without consultation or consent, already erected a 2metre fence blocking our line of sight to the highway and the cul-de-sac area but it is tapered down at the start his own property This type of fencing would definitely NOT be our preferred choice.

Materials were delivered within two days and work started on the third day following the Planning Committee decision to refuse the previous application on the grounds the development would constitute an over development of the site to the detriment of the character of the street scene and adjacent residential amenity contrary to Policy 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

The Report states that timber cladding to the front elevation has been added to the project. We point out that this is not an addition as it was included in the previous application.

Mr JT and Mrs L Johnson

19 Lytham Drive,

Waltham.

Bethany Loring (Engie)

From: Lorraine Johnson
Sent: 28 November 2021 16:30
To: Bethany Loring (Engie)
Subject: DM/1112/21/FUL

WE ARE OBJECTING to planning application DM/1112/21/FUL relating to 18 Lytham Drive Waltham. We are neighbours at 19 Lytham Drive, having lived in our ground floor bungalow for over eight years.

This new application shows there are no changes to the previous application regarding the extensions to the front of the property and therefore no change regarding the detrimental effect the plans will have on the street scene.

The character of the surrounding area is very well established with detached properties that all have adequate separation between adjoining frontages on both sides of the boundary line. As the building line comes forward 3.2metres and the completed work will sit on the boundary at the front plus the dormer is so close to the rear boundary, we suggest there is not adequate separation between the two properties.

At the moment No18 is set back from our property. The proposed ground floor front extensions will project from the front wall of No 18 by 3.2metres which will cover and overshadow our side sitting room window/office by 1.6metres. There will be only 0.96metres left between the two properties and this excludes a walkway bringing the works to sit on the boundary line.

In addition to depriving us of natural daylight and sunlight it will be intrusive and result in a sense of overshadowing and overbearing - a boxed-in feel - resulting in loss of Amenity and that would have a detrimental impact on our lives.

We note the side of the dormer has been redesigned to include what appears to be an area jutting out but the overall length remains at 5.9metres. This part of the dormer extension is only separated from the two properties by 0.6metres.

There is no change in the depth of 3.7metres facing the street scene and the overall eaves height will be 5metres and the overall height 5.2metres. It will be seen above the boundary and overlook and overshadow our private back garden and seating area by 2.2metres, resulting in loss of Amenity.

The side extension to No17 remains the same size in length at 6.33metres leaving only 0.4metres from the boundary between the two properties. Therefore, together with the walkway sitting on our boundary to No18, we suggest it is fair to say that apart from 0.4metres, the ground floor extensions will stretch nigh on from one boundary to the other.

We maintain that the proposed ground floor extensions and the dormer are too close to our property and overall too big a build for the size of the plot. They will be highly visible from the street and will not be in conformity with the character and setting of the area. Therefore the over development will be totally out of character and detrimental to the street scene.

Properties in this area and especially in Lytham Drive are ground floor bungalows. No 18 is the only property to have an existing converted loft with a front facing window and rear facing windows.

To bring the front further forward by 3.2 metres will only just emphasis how much out of character it will be in terms of the street scene compared to existing properties in the immediate vicinity. Sadly it could also result in a detrimental precedent being set especially in this area and to Lytham Drive itself.

We point out that the previous application was unanimously refused by the Planning Committee on the grounds the development would constitute an over development of the site to the detriment of the character of the street scene and adjacent residential amenity contrary to Policy 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

We suggest There are no significant changes to the previous application and certainly none to the front extensions to justify approval to this new application.

Mr JT and Mrs L Johnson,
19 Lytham Drive Waltham,
DN370DG.

Megan Green (Engie)

From: Bradley Parish Council <bradleyparishcouncil@gmail.com>
Sent: 18 October 2021 12:15
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: Planning Application No: DM/0774/21/FUL

Good Morning

Ref: Planning Application No: DM/0744/21/FUL

With reference to the above application Bradley Parish Council held an Extra Ordinary Meeting on 14th October 2021, where we concluded that we had to strongly object to this application, the reasons as follows:

This application is far too minimal in detail and the areas listed with 'associated works' gives no detail whatsoever on anything other than four glamping pods. And therefore Bradley Parish Council request this application be turned down and a new application be submitted with details as follows:

- This application appears to supersede the recent application and may thus nullify any conditions to that? At this point there is no evidence to suggest that the applicant is making any effort to open for the business granted already. Evidence?
- Glamping pods would appear to be outside agricultural use for which the site has permission, and would change it to being commercial/tourism. Their occupation would bring additional traffic to the site which would be multi use and would pose a danger at the bend of a busy road.
- There is no evidence of a business plan attached to this application.
- There is no mention of the dimensions of the pods so in turn there is no mention of any limitation on the number of people per pod and if any extra visitors would be allowed.
- There is no detail on any drainage systems or any washing and toilet facilities. The application quotes 'associated use' which we feel is far too open ended and could include anything.
- Is this to be a seasonal letting if so, we need date details or an annual letting?
- When the previous application DM/0881/20/FUL was approved there were conditions that clearly stated that if the business had not been expanded considerably in a three year period, the site had to be cleared. How could this be enforced if a further business had been established on the same site?

Conclusion: Given the history of this site and the actions of the owner we feel it is imperative that all details are listed on a new application to enable us to make an informed decision.

Thank you

Val Turner
 Chair Bradley Parish Council

Comments for Planning Application DM/0744/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0744/21/FUL

Address: Caravan At The Shepherds Purse Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire DN37 0AL

Proposal: Erect four glamping pods with associated works, install welfare unit and install storage facility with associated works

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Malcolm Hoole26

Address: Netherwood Bradley Road Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object strongly to this application

This is a commercial enterprise involving a number of ancillary support buildings in a peaceful rural agricultural setting and is completely inappropriate I give the following reasons
increased traffic on a busy road

Restricted access turning on and off the site entrance by drivers who will be unfamiliar with the road danger and bends

Advertising signage

Effect on natural wild life

Effect of introducing visiting public

Intrusive noise and increased traffic

Light pollution

Waste management and disposal

Delivery vehicles on and off site

Comments for Planning Application DM/0744/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0744/21/FUL

Address: Caravan At The Shepherds Purse Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire DN37 0AL

Proposal: Erect four glamping pods with associated works, install welfare unit and install storage facility with associated works

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Malcolm Hoole26

Address: Netherwood Bradley Road Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:I object strongly to this application

This is a commercial enterprise involving a number of ancillary support buildings in a peaceful rural agricultural setting and is completely inappropriate I give the following reasons
increased traffic on a busy road

Restricted access turning on and off the site entrance by drivers who will be unfamiliar with the road danger and bends

Advertising signage

Effect on natural wild life

Effect of introducing visiting public

Intrusive noise and increased traffic

Light pollution

Waste management and disposal

Delivery vehicles on and off site

Comments for Planning Application DM/0744/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0744/21/FUL

Address: Caravan At The Shepherds Purse Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire DN37 0AL

Proposal: Erect four glamping pods with associated works, install welfare unit and install storage facility with associated works

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Miss Faye Craven

Address: 51 Bradley road Barnoldby le beck

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I strongly object due to the following:-

More traffic on an already busy road

More noise

More light pollution on the edge of a dark village

Less wildlife allowed to roam free due to the above.

If this gets passed it looks like nepotism.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0744/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0744/21/FUL

Address: Caravan At The Shepherds Purse Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire DN37 0AL

Proposal: Erect four glamping pods with associated works, install welfare unit and install storage facility with associated works

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Wishart

Address: 59 deadly road Waltham Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We would like to object because this applicant has again and again completely ignored the decisions which the planning department have decided. In the beginning the planning department refused the static caravan for a dwelling, The applicant ignored the planning department's decision and placed a static caravan on the land anyway. The applicant (a councillor) has since twice ignored the planning departments decisions. When will this end that councillors can override a planning decision and get away with it ? For their own personal gain .
Ooops .

Comments for Planning Application DM/0744/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0744/21/FUL

Address: Caravan At The Shepherds Purse Bradley Road Bradley North East Lincolnshire DN37 0AL

Proposal: Erect four glamping pods with associated works, install welfare unit and install storage facility with associated works

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Hudson

Address: 59 Deadly road Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We would like to object to this proposal as the owner has many times ignored the conditions on which he has gained other permissions on this site .

In the outline as well as 4 glamping pods he wants permission for associated works ? This could mean he can do anything that he thinks can be associated with the pods , this leaves many many opportunities for this land owner to do what he wants .

Unfortunately we all know this will be passed as councillor Shepherd is a Councillor who has not abided by previous conditions.

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Kate Caulfield

Address: 8 BUTTERCUP COURT HEALING GRIMSBY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I support this application as it will mean that Twist and flip can run their gymnastics sessions all year round without having to close or have sessions disrupted for exams to be held etc like at their current venue.

I'm aware that there is another gymnastics club down the road but this shouldn't affect their business as each club has their own gymnasts already.

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sarah Parker

Address: 92 Crow Hill Avenue Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: My daughter has been a member of Grimsby twist and flip for the last couple of years; I have personally witnessed an enormous positive change, not just in my daughter but the other children that attend. Nicky, Mark and the other coaches don't just teach fitness and physical well-being, they build confidence, provide emotional support and ensure the mental well-being of all of their gymnasts. They teach the gymnasts (and families) that anything is possible whilst providing a safe, nurturing space to train. I fully support the club relocating to said venue as they will be able to provide these opportunities to many more children and families that are more centrally located and rely on public transport- in turn more gymnasts would mean more job opportunities for local people, which is exactly what this area needs!

Grimsby twist and flip go above and beyond for their gymnasts and their families, I feel they deserve the opportunity to further grow and develop their club and become a bigger asset to the area.

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Gemma Ashurst

Address: 33 Escart Avenue GRIMSBY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I think this would be a great opportunity for Grimsby Twist and Flip gymnastics as it would create a larger, more sustainable space for the gymnastics to train in and would provide them with a more secure building and premises.

I also believe that this is a great opportunity for the surrounding area and would help to support and create more jobs in the near future and opportunities for those who wish to start a career in sports.

I also believe that as the premises is close to the town centre it will attract more gymnasts to want and be able to train as it is easy to access through different transport methods, this would then in turn support and be great for the local economy.

Nicky and Mark go above and beyond for all the gymnasts that they train and I really do believe that by allowing them to have this building as the new home of Grimsby Twist and Flip that it would benefit all those that are involved (gymnast, coaches and the local area).

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Angela Williams

Address: 53Ings Lane Waltham Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The parking in the area will not accommodate safely 2 Gymnastics clubs in close proximity. There is also Pool Hall/ Lounge not to mention many businesses with limited parking very close and at times of classes & especially competition days there are cars filling the street & adjacent streets already. Any further additional parking would be unsafe. I cannot imagine what it would be like if both gymnastics clubs were to hold a competition on the same day!

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Rebecca Swallow

Address: 60 lestrange street Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: With regards to the above proposed facility being used as a gymnastics club, isn't this a conflict of interest with it being within close proximity of another gymnastics club?

Twist and flip do not hold a creditable reputation and are well known for its sole purpose being for financial gain rather than the well-being of its gymnastics.

Parking facilities on competition days, drop offs for sessions, customer parking are scarce for one gymnastics club never mind 2 virtually next door to each other.

I feel it will hinder the current gymnastics club already facilitated within the same road and have a detrimental effect on their business whom is a non profit organisation.

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Karen Goodwin

Address: 24 New Rd Waltham Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Although there is nothing wrong with healthy competition within businesses it makes no sense to have 2 gymnastic academy's within such close proximity. Just seems a strange decision to position another gymnastic academy next to an already established academy.

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mr C Lines

Address: Samuel Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I believe this would be a fantastic opportunity for Grimsby Twist and Flip gymnastics as it would create a larger and more sustainable space for the gymnasts to train in and would provide them with more suitable premises than they currently occupy so long as the facilities comply with any specific requirements such as Sport England rules. It will also fetch a currently vacant and disused property back into use.

I also feel that this is a great opportunity for the surrounding community and would provide a much needed increased and enhanced all year-round gymnastics leisure offer and support the ongoing regeneration of Grimsby, linked to the Grimsby Town Masterplan, which in turn is aimed at supporting the local economy.

Both facilities are likely to already have an established client base so will not necessarily directly be competing against each other. In a free market, competition is healthy.

Given the pressures on parking across NEL as a whole, I do not believe parking alone to be a determining factor on which to raise a representation, as all tenants in those properties would have at some point faced parking pressures. Additionally, concerning parking, King Edward street benefits from being on or near a main public transport route and is actually 15 minutes walk from the main public bus hub and town centre.

I would also like to raise that to date there have been no objections from the neighbouring businesses, with the exception of Eclipse, which is key.

I would also like to comment on some of the objections raised.

"Lastly the proposal states that the moving to the new building will allow for the gymnastics club to double their staffing numbers by 2023, before the COVID19 pandemic they had similar numbers to those proposed but those staff have since left for various reasons" - This is not a material planning consideration.

"Twist and flip do not hold a 'creditable' reputation and are well known for its sole purpose being for financial gain rather than the well-being of its gymnastics" - again not a material planning consideration. Additionally, this could be verging on defamation of character.

"Any further additional parking would be unsafe" - again whilst parking may be a planning consideration, this comment is not valid without evidence.

"On Saturdays, parking space is at a premium on King Edward Street and nearby side streets, 'due to' the busy gymnastics club already situated there. Adding another children's sports club to the same street would further exacerbate the issue, and may present a safety concern for the children, with so many cars coming and going throughout the morning" - This causation of parking being a premium cannot be solely linked to one business surely?

"Additionally, some of the gymnastics apparatus included in the floor plans requires a height clearance of several metres in order to ensure safe usage. As the building is across two floors, the height clearance available 'doesn't appear' to be adequate for the equipment that is intended to be used" - this would be something that would have to be confirmed through the planning and consultation process.

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Jade Parnell

Address: 27 Ward Street Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This is a great gym club the team are amazing and would be a nice chance for them to expand their club on a new site - would be nice to work with other clubs in the area.

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mr Gareth Parnell

Address: 27 Ward St Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This gymnastics club would be a great addition to the area and could create a lot of Job opportunities as they continue to grow. The club themselves always have there gymnasts best interests in mind, creating the best atmosphere for them to express themselves in. The owners are friendly, approachable and very reasonable with all of the parents that attend.

Comments for Planning Application DM/1090/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/1090/21/FUL

Address: Former Doric Anderton Premises King Edward Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Change of use from industrial building to gymnastics academy

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Customer Details

Name: Mr Tom Fields

Address: 42 Wollaston Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Through looking at the proposal, firstly I would echo what others have said regarding the parking situation and add that the governing body for gymnastics highly recommend that parents are allowed to stay and watch, so there will be cars parking up outside every evening.

I would also like to bring into question the safety of the planned layout as the equipment being used requires a height clearance of either 5 metres or 6.5 metres depending on what equipment it is.

Lastly the proposal states that the moving to the new building will allow for the gymnastics club to double their staffing numbers by 2023, before the COVID19 pandemic they had similar numbers to those proposed but those staff have since left for various reasons.

From: Lauren Fields
Sent: 12 November 2021 11:01
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Application Ref: DM/1090/21/FUL
Importance: High

Good Morning,

Planning Application Reference: DM/1090/21/FUL

I oppose the proposal to change the usage of this venue into a gymnastics club. The project overview statement says that the majority of the other businesses on King Edward Street close between 5pm and 6pm. However, those businesses which do remain open later in the evening still receive a substantial amount of vehicular traffic. On Thursday 11th November at 6.10pm, I drove down King Edward Street and noticed that JDP Lounge, Eclipse Gymnastics Centre, Docks Beers, and Grimsby Business Centre were all open, with cars parked either directly outside or nearby. In addition, the entrance to Victoria Retail Park is almost directly opposite the proposed venue. Although this does not present an issue with parking, as the retail park has its own car park, it clearly does provide a considerable amount of traffic to the area.

The application form states the intention to retain the four parking spaces currently allocated to the unit. However, the project overview statement refers to two staff members' cars, and up to six cars for parents of children attending the pre-school programme during the daytime. This requires double the allocated number of parking spaces, and so will take up more space on the nearby streets.

On Saturdays, parking space is at a premium on King Edward Street and nearby side streets, due to the busy gymnastics club already situated there. Adding another children's sports club to the same street would further exacerbate the issue, and may present a safety concern for the children, with so many cars coming and going throughout the morning.

Additionally, some of the gymnastics apparatus included in the floor plans requires a height clearance of several metres in order to ensure safe usage. As the building is across two floors, the height clearance available doesn't appear to be adequate for the equipment that is intended to be used.

Kind regards,

Lauren Fields
42 Wollaston Road
Cleethorpes
North East Lincolnshire
DN35 8DX

North East Lincolnshire Development
Management Services
New Oxford House
2 George Street
Grimsby
North East Lincolnshire
DN31 1HB



Working in Partnership

Telephone: 01472 326289 – Option 1

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ward Member Reply Slip for Applications to be reported to the Planning Committee

Application Number	Reason for Referring to Planning Committee
DM/0602/21/FULA ERECT TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH ROOF LIGHTS TO PROVIDE CAR PORT WITH BEDROOM IN ROOF SPACE ABOVE	I HAVE HAD RESIDENTS CALL ME ON THIS APPLICATION. OPINIONS ARE EQUALLY DIVIDED FOR AND AGAINST. IT IS ONLY BY COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT AND DISCUSSION THAT A FAIR AND EQUITABLE RESOLUTION WILL BE FOUND

Contact Details: ✓

Signature ...

Date 3RD AUGUST 2021

Name DAVID HASTHORPE

Address: 12 LINDSEY DRIVE HEALING DN41 7NU

Comments for Planning Application DM/0602/21/FULA

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0602/21/FULA

Address: 3 Oak Road Healing North East Lincolnshire DN41 7RJ

Proposal: Erect two storey side extension with roof lights to provide car port with bedroom in roof space above

Case Officer: Emily Davidson

Customer Details

Name: Sheena Barnes

Address: 1 oak rd Healing Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Looking at the amended plans I have noted that the building has been reduced by a mere half a metre. This will make little difference as it will still dominate the windows in my Kitchen, Dining room, sitting room and Bedroom on the N/E side of property which is all the windows on that side. However if the Gable wall be replaced with a Hip end it would not be so intrusive although still inappropriate to the area between the properties. I trust you will agree with my previous comments and these on the minor amendment and reject this application.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0602/21/FULA

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0602/21/FULA

Address: 3 Oak Road Healing North East Lincolnshire DN41 7RJ

Proposal: Erect two storey side extension with roof lights to provide car port with bedroom in roof space above

Case Officer: Emily Davidson

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sheena Barnes

Address: 1 Oak Road Healing Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I consider this to be overdevelopment of a small area between 2 properties. Looking at the plans this building will dominate the windows to our Kitchen Dining room Sitting Room and Bedroom on the N/E side of property. However if the Gable wall of the proposed extension be replaced with a Hip roof it would not be so intrusive.

I consider this to be an ugly extension and would not add to the aesthetics to either property nor be an enhancement to the area of Oak Rd in the central area of Healing.

I trust you will agree and reject this application.

North East Lincolnshire Development
Management Services
New Oxford House
2 George Street
Grimsby
North East Lincolnshire
DN31 1HB



Telephone: 01472 326289 – Option 1

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ward Member Reply Slip for Applications to be reported to the Planning Committee

Application Number	Reason for Referring to Planning Committee
DM/0969/21/FUL	As this is not being supported by heritage or officers I am requesting this is brought before the committee for a closer look

Contact Details: -

SignatureCllr Hayden Dawkins (NELC)..... Date ...13th December 2021

NameCllr Hayden Dawkins (NELC)

Address:61 Glebe road Humberston, Grimsby DN36 4JP...

.....



Humberston Village Council

Clerk to the Council – Mrs. K. Peers

*Tel:- 07494 577661 Email:-
 clerk@humberstonvillagecouncil.com*

TO: planning@nelincs.gov.uk

Planning Consultation Comments

11th October 2021

Dear Sirs,

The Village Council considered the following applications at its meeting held on Wednesday 6th October 2021 and wishes to submit the comments as shown:

Planning Application Reference: DM/0969/21/FUL

Proposal: Variation of Condition 21 (Approved Plans) pursuant to DM/0199/16/FUL to amend plots 5 and 6 to one dwelling instead of two dwellings and external alterations

Location: Manor House Tetney Road Humberston

No objections

Yours faithfully,

KJ Peers

KJ Peers

Clerk to the Council

*1 Beach View Court, Norfolk Lane, Cleethorpes
 NE Lincs. DN35 8BT*