



To North East Lincolnshire Council Planning Department
New Oxford House
2 George Street
Grimsby
DN31 1HB

Contact Lauren Birkwood Date 8th July 2021
Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Copy: The Chief Executive Rob Walsh
Councillor Phillip Jackson
Councillor Catherine Hogan

There is overwhelming opposition to this development from local residents, leisure users and dog walkers, visitors to Weelsby Woods, motorists and Grimsby residents of which this brief survey taken over two days confirms and is a representative cross section.

In view of this it is requested the application is discussed in full Council and not decided by delegated powers.

We the signatories on the attached petition forms do hereby register our objection to Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL for the following reasons :

1. This area whilst left fallow has become an outstanding established area of natural beauty attracting many species such as both Muntjac and Roe deer the latter with fawn - photos available. There are also many species of bird, wild orchids and extremely importantly amphibians which inhabit the area particularly from the water course to the south of the proposed development. These are known to include toads, frogs and possibly crested newts. If an investigation has been conducted in respect of the latter I would be helpful if a copy was available. The attraction for the amphibians to the proposed site is its low lying and extremely poorly drained area at certain times of the year acting as a minor floodplain for the residential area to the north.
2. This area with a variety of established self set trees of many varieties, shrubs and grasses has become a defined curtilage of the residential southern boundary of the town extending from the adjacent area of beauty and leisure Weelsby Woods to Humberston Road.
3. This area for thirty years and beyond has become an established access route to Weelsby Woods from the Davenport Road residential area for dog walkers, runners, cyclists, and school cross country runs. **Established Rights Of Way** to the southern boundary and central.
4. The access and exit of the site onto Humberston Road does present a dangerous 'blind' situation as visibility is limited as the road bends and not all motorists drive this section within the speed limit.
5. The density of traffic (122 houses) combined with that of the proposed much larger development at the Tesco roundabout will create untenable traffic management problems particularly at peak times affecting Weelsby Road, Clee Road and Love Lane junction roundabout .
6. A development would certainly affect the surface drainage, which can already be a problem for gardens of established adjacent properties to the site.

7. Mains drainage of the proposed low lying site would already overload an old mains drainage system and would have to be pumped a considerable distance as there is no adjacent mains drain to the site. The potential ensuing main drain 'back up' problems for established properties are of serious concern.
8. This proposed development, in addition to that of the Tesco roundabout development will place a serious burden on education and health which are already at capacity in the area. Doctors surgeries are already not accepting further patient registrations and the decline on health care availability, in addition to Covid will impact substantially on the lives of the existing residents in our area in which it is accepted it is difficult to attract health care professionals.

We also add that any large scale machinery action, land scraping, tree demolition prior to a full consideration of the above points on this site, particularly in relation to objection 1., now brought to the attention of the local authority, with regard to the requested amphibian investigations (Crested Newts) could be in breach of rules regarding wild life preservation.

Valid points of the objection.

NATURE AND CONSERVATION, GEOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE, DRAINAGE, TRAFFIC LOGISTICS AND SAFETY, HEALTH AND EDUCATION AND A SERIOUS IMPACT AND REDUCTION IN THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR EXISTING RESIDENTS.

Anthony Bell
9 Vaughan Avenue
Grimsby
DN32 8QB

To North East Lincolnshire Council Planning Department
 New Oxford House
 2 George Street
 Grimsby
 DN31 1HB



Objections to Planning Application Ref: DM/0552/21/FUL Humberston Rd, Grimsby

Date	Name	Address
7/7/21	Huxford	168 NEELSON ROAD GRIMSBY
7/7/21	D. UNWORTH	38 LOCKWELL AV GY
7/7/21	L. UNWORTH	38 LOCKWELL AV GY
7-7-21	S. Mickleburgh	38 claby close
7-7-21	A. Mickleburgh	38 claby close
7-7-21	C. BROWN	13 ABBEY DRIVE WEST GY
7-7-21	M. Fletcher	45 Daubney Street
7-7-21	A.H	21 Mirkfield Road, Grimsby
7-7-21	A.8	19 ROSAIRE PLACE
7-7-21	N. MASON	12 FOUNTAINS AVENUE GRIMSBY
7/7/21	Joe D	17 Lady Frances Crescent, DN35 9JU
7/7/21	F	25 Humberston Avenue DN36 4SL
7-7-21	C.H.	5 Jenner Court cips DN35 7PH
7-7-21	E. T.	18 COLLEGE GARDENS GY DN33 2JN
7-7-21	J.R.	129 Patrick Street
7-7-21	P. SYLVESTER	15 SPURN AVE.
7-7-21	T. WOOD	48 Cresshill Ave
7-7-21	A. GRAVES	26 ST JOHNS ROAD DN36 4DY
7-7-21	MARR BAL	51 CHESTNUT RD, WATMAN, DN37 0DL
7/7/21	JK To	293 Station Road, New Waltham
7/7/21	M. To	2 — — — — — DN36 4QJ
7/7/21	Si N	43 Tetney Road Humberston
7/7/21	N. BRADBURY	LANDOW, NORTH THORPESBY DN36 5PP
7/7/21	K. B.	4 Beck Farm Mews, Burnoldhake Beck, DN37 0BH
7/7/21	S. V.	12 Vincent Road Grimsby, DN33 3SF
7/7/21	AS	7 VALLIS HAN AVE DN32 8QB
7/7/21	N.S.	" " " "
7/7/21	Jo T.	32 Vivian Ave, DN32 8QF
7/7/21	M. B.	32 Vivian Ave, DN32 8QF

To North East Lincolnshire Council Planning Department
 New Oxford House
 2 George Street
 Grimsby
 DN31 1HB

Objections to Planning Application Ref: DM/0552/21/FUL Humberston Rd, Grimsby

Date	Name	Address
7.7.21	GP	8 Vaughan Ave Grimsby
7.7.21	K Pearson	10 Vaughan Ave Grimsby
7.7.21	C Pearson	10 Vaughan Ave Grimsby
7.7.21	G BUTLER	12 Vaughan Ave Grimsby
7.7.21	R	27 VAUGHAN AVE GRIMSBY
7.7.21	D.P.	27 Vaughan Ave Grimsby
7.7.21	M.O.	15 TRANBY DRIVE GRIMSBY
7.7.21	H.K. ALLENDY	13 TRANBY DRIVE GRIMSBY
7.7.21	F.P.R.	10 TRANBY DRIVE GRIMSBY
7.7.21	J	10 TRANBY DRIVE GRIMSBY
7.7.21	C SMITH	33 EDWARD ST CPS
7.7.21	M.B. M.M.	29 Vaughan Ave Grimsby
7.7.21	M.L.	21 Vaughan Ave Grimsby
7.7.21	W GAMBRAITH-DEAN	13 Heron Close Gt
7.7.21	R.E. EATON	13A Vaughan Ave Gt
7.7.21	GAE	9 Vaughan Ave Gt
7.7.21	P.H.	41 Fildes Rd
7/7/21	C.E.N.	1. Davis Place Cleethorpes
7/7/21	A.D.	80. Queen Mary Ave
7.7.21	L FRANKEN	45 Durham Grove Grimsby
7.7.21	M.P.	14 Robinson Gdns
7.7.21	P.B.	2 Main Road BABLDICK
7/7/21	K.B.	117 Newhaven Place Grimsby
7/7/21	L.M. S.	17 Howard Grove Grimsby
7/7/21	K. HERESNIAK	69 ALGERNON STREET
	S.T.	13, Cove St DN32

WILD ORCHIDS PYRAMID & COMMON.

To North East Lincolnshire Council Planning Department
 New Oxford House
 2 George Street
 Grimsby
 DN31 1HB

Objections to Planning Application Ref: DM/0552/21/FUL Humberston Rd, Grimsby

Date	Name	Address
6/7/21	T. CRITTEN	23 VIVIAN AVE
6/7/21	A. H.	21 VIVIAN AVE
6/7/21	Jackie Wilson	19 Vivian Avenue
6/7/21	Chris Gunster	19 Vivian Avenue
6/7/21	F. R.	17 Vivian Ave DN32 8QF
6/7/21	E. N.	15 Vivian Ave g.y. DN32 8QF
6-7-21	MARTIN NANGLE	15 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	M. T.	7 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	MAUREEN DEAR	5 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	M. L.	6 Vivian Ave DN32 8QF
6-7-21	F. PORTRESS	10 VIVIAN AVE
6-7-21	A. F.	10 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	E. FRANKISH	12 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	A. Hutton	14 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	D. Hutton	14 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	C. Lette	18 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	H. BURN	18 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	D. Bunn	18 VIVIAN AVE - DN32 8QF
6-7-21	J. C.	22 Vivian Ave DN32 8QF
6-7-21	M. B.	9. VAUGHAN AVE DN32 8QB
6-7-21	T. H.	30 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	K. M.	23 VIVIAN AVE DN32 8QF
6-7-21	N.	MICHAEL ROAD 19 VAUGHAN AVENUE
6-7-21	N.	NICOLA ROAD 19 VAUGHAN AVENUE
7/7/21	S. A.	2 VIVIAN AVE
7/7/21	K. GRAY	26 VIVIAN AVENUE

To North East Lincolnshire Council Planning Department
 New Oxford House
 2 George Street
 Grimsby
 DN31 1HB

Objections to Planning Application Ref: DM/0552/21/FUL Humberston Rd, Grimsby

Date	Name	Address
7-7-21	D. Pickett	3 ASHRIDGE DRIVE CLEETHORPES
7-7-21	M. GREGG	4 ASHRIDGE DRIVE CLEETHORPES
7-7-21	J. GREGG	4 ASHRIDGE DRIVE CLEETHORPES
7-7-21	D.S.	5 ASHRIDGE DRIVE CLEETHORPES
7-7-21	D. Wilkinson	6 Ashridge Drive Cleethorpes
6-7-21	K. Clark	7 Ashridge Drive Cleethorpes
7-7-21	R. ZAWISZA	9 ASHRIDGE DRIVE Cleethorpes
7-7-21	L. CONLAN	12 ASHRIDGE DRIVE CLEETHORPES DN35 9NN
7-7-21	T. W.	13 Ashridge Drive DN35 9NN
7-7-21	D. AUGER	15 ASHRIDGE DRIVE DN35 9NN
7-7-21	C. Ward	18 ASHRIDGE DRIVE DN35 9NN
11	M. WINDLOW	22 ASHRIDGE DRIVE DN35 9NN
	R. C.	24 ASHRIDGE DRIVE DN35 9NN
17-7-21	L. T.	23 Ashridge Drive DN35 9NN
7-7-21	L. C.	24 ASHRIDGE DRIVE DN35 9NN
7-7-21	N. MARSHALL	27 ASHRIDGE DRIVE DN35 9NN
7-7-21	A. C.	29 Ashridge Drive DN35 9NN
7-7-21	R. M.	1. VAUGHANAY DN32 8QB
7-7-21	C. M. FIELD	4
	N. ALLEN	3 VAUGHAN AVE DN32 8QB
7-7-21	D. OTTER	5 VAUGHAN AVE DN32 8QB
7-7-21	C.S.	9 VILLA COURT
7-7-21	L. WHITE	26 Ashridge Drive
7-7-21	C. G.	28 Ashridge Drive
7-7-21	M. APPLETON	31 Ashridge Drive
7-7-21	H.	32 Ashridge Drive

To North East Lincolnshire Council Planning Department
 New Oxford House
 2 George Street
 Grimsby
 DN31 1HB

Objections to Planning Application Ref: DM/0552/21/FUL Humberston Rd, Grimsby

Date	Name	Address
7 th /7/21	AMY B. BOLLAND	31 Edward St Clee DN35 8B
7/7/21	LEE SMITH	33 EDWARD ST. CLEETHORPES DN35 8A -
7/7/21	ASHLEIGH BLOSHARD	31 Edward St Clee DN35 8PS
7-7-2021	C. SMITH	33 EDWARD ST CLPS
7-7-21	B. HOLMES	29 Edward ST. CLEETHORPES DN35 8PS
7/7/21	N. CAULIN	29 Edward ST. CLEETHORPES DN35 8PS
7 th /7/21	D. ZEPERN	16 EDWARD ST CLEETHORPES
7-7-21	D.B.	35 Edward St Cleethorpes
7-7-21	Z.H.	37 Edward St CLPS

Tony 9.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways, estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Mark Smith

Address: 94 Grove Crescent Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Ward Councillor

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to object to this development and reserve the right to address committee

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways , estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Nadine Marshalsea

Address: 27 ASHRIDGE DRIVE, CLEETHORPES

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Further to my comments of 27th June, I have now looked at the plans and have noticed that, where the access road is proposed, it is exactly opposite our front window. This will affect us immensely as all cars headlights exiting the road on darker evenings will shine straight into our front room window , has this aspect of disruption been considered?

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways, estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Nadine Marshalsea

Address: 27 ASHRIDGE DRIVE, CLEETHORPES

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I consider the proposal of building 122 dwellings plus associated garages in the allocated space as excessive for the area, surely a smaller development commensurate with the area would be more ecologically and environmentally friendly.

My main concerns are as follows:

1) The increased volume of traffic along Humberston Road, which at certain times of the day is extremely busy and noisy, with often backlogs of standing traffic. It is already sometimes nigh on impossible to exit right from Ashridge Drive onto Humberston Road and with the potential of there being at least another 150 vehicles (a conservative estimate) exiting and entering the proposed development, the problems will therefore be exacerbated, causing frustration and becoming even more dangerous. Also with the extra associated vehicles there would be an increase in air and noise pollution.

Further problems could be caused by a backlog of traffic between the access point and Lovelane Corner roundabout which will result in Ashridge Drive being used as a 'rat run' by vehicles wanting to escape any back up traffic, this has occurred in the past.

I would like to know why the daily traffic flows, in the Air Quality Assessment Report are based on figures taken from 2011 and why no recent studies have been implemented. The amount of traffic using Humberston Road has increased considerably in the last 10 years.

2) I have concerns over the matter of flooding, as there are areas in the fields which are often waterlogged. Where is the water going to go, we have in the past been flooded down the drive and in our gardens, is this going to cause us further problems in the future?

3) Another major concern is regarding the wildlife which inhabits and roams through the area. We have many different varieties of birds coming into the front garden, which nest in the hedgerow and trees opposite, there is a kestrel who regularly hunts for food in the field. Families of foxes, even deer, move between the fields, the woods and even some gardens, these will all be displaced. The area has long been a place for wildlife to live in safety!

4) The length of time it is going to take to complete this development, two to three years of disruption, noise, dirt, dust, heavy lorries going in and out of the site whilst building, will have an impact on all the people residing in the area, making it a highly unpleasant place to live.

5) A final point. I noticed that in the statements provided, it was stated that the fields are classed a brownfield site, how can this be possible, when there has never to my knowledge been any buildings/development on this area, it was always previously agricultural land so surely this should be classed as a greenfield site!

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways, estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Gemma Goodwin

Address: 28 Ashridge Drive Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I would like to express my objections for the proposal of 122 properties on Humberston Road, opposite Ashridge Drive.

My main concerns are the traffic and congestion this will cause and the risk to flooding of my property. Firstly, Humberston Road is a main road used by many cars and emergency vehicles as a main route. It is also used by many school children either walking or on bikes going to the nearby schools of Bursar, Beacon, Havelock and Clee Academy. My concern is the more vehicles on this road there are likely to be more accidents and even fatalities with how fast some cars drive along the road. As it is now, some cars do not wait for you to turn into the private road but overtake, if this was to happen with residents of the said proposal then RTC's would become very common.

The other concern of flooding to my property, this week with the storms that have passed through Cleethorpes has led to flooding of my back garden and garage. A man hole is located in my back garden, this week, due to the amount of rain and poor drainage system along Ashridge Drive, my garden was saturated and the man hole cover was lifting up due to the water being level with the grass. Water was running down from Lovelane corner roundabout and found the lowest point in my garden. With another 122 properties built adjacent to my property, where is the extra water going to go?

Kind regards

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways, estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Matthew Appleton

Address: 31 Ashridge Drive Ashridge Drive Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: After careful viewing of plans, we object over the following

1. Entrance to the 122 property's which will face our house and feel that a better location for this needed. Also, a factoring concern is that light pollution from cars entering and exiting the new development will be directed into our living room on evenings

2. The removal of Animals Habitats that do inhabit this area of land badger, foxes, swifts, pheasant's and even deer's which use this area in late September to early November for rutting and a numerous species of birds for nesting. Also, with this established area of wild vegetation that wildlife uses the loss of it in my opinion would not be beneficial to them or the battle to help soak up carbon dioxide

3. Air and noise pollution from this number of houses and the associated vehicles would be a concern. Increased traffic needs along Humberston road would add greater traffic congestion in peak times as it is a major busy road at the best of times

4. Also feel that there is a lack of infrastructure for schools in the area that could accommodate the number of houses that are proposed to be erected and that have been built in the area in the last few years in line with the Education Act 1996

be happy to discuss these issues further

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways , estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Alan Gower

Address: 4 Villa Court Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:I am a neighbour of over 11 years occupying a property facing/overlooking the proposed development and have been employed in the construction industry for over 45 years, I am not generally opposed to progress and development, but, on this occasion I am vehemently opposed to the proposals, reasons being:-

- a) Vehicular traffic
- b) Pedestrians
- d) Inadequate public services
- e) Further proposed developments
- f) Trees, vegetation and nature conservation
- g) Incorrect plans/documents

- a) Vehicular Traffic

As stated I have lived on the adjacent development for over 11 years, which consist of 8 properties with only 12 permanent vehicles plus visitors accessing and egressing the development and over the years it has become increasingly difficult to turn onto Humberston Road to the point that turning right out of the development is almost impossible.

It is now proposed to build a further 122 properties, which on a conservative estimate would be at least an additional 200 vehicles accessing and egressing Humberston Road, an already very busy, main feeder road through the town to which speed limits are rarely adhered to.

Furthermore, there has been little or no proposals for road improvements to Humberston Road at the junctions of Vaughan Ave., Ashridge Drive or Davenport Drive, let alone Villa Court or the proposed development.

The increased traffic is going to lead to congestion, accidents and subsequently the safety of drivers and pedestrians.

b) Pedestrians

As stated our Villa Court development consists of 8 properties, occupied by families equating to 12 adults and 7 children of various ages.

On numerous occasions the conversation with neighbours is the concern over the safety of the children crossing Humberston Road and lack of safe crossing points, bearing in mind the majority of the children attend schools on the other side of Humberston Road.

The proposal for a additional 122 dwellings could possibly equate to an estimated 150+ children accessing and egressing Humberston Road at the busiest times of the day, yet, only one crossing point has been proposed, is this to be controlled or not, and what about provisions for cycle paths, as I am sure the existing joint pedestrian, cycle path on Humberston Road won't be adequate.

Again, I feel the additional number of pedestrians generated by the proposed development, the lack of proposed provisions and the additional traffic will lead to safety being compromising.

c) Drainage

It is of great concern following experiences on our Villa Court development and due to the rapidly changes to environmental conditions and subsequent frequency and impact of storm conditions, which recently caused partial flooding of rear gardens, a drainage system which struggled to cope and causing toilets unable to discharge correctly, that the proposed surface water is to be discharged and remains on the area of the proposed development, this could lead to temporary flooding, furthermore and more concerning is the proposal for the foul drainage system for the new development be pumped into a drainage system in Davenport Drive which was designed decades ago and not for the additional overload proposed.

d) Inadequate Public Services

It is already quite apparent that our health service, doctors and dentists, and education provisions are running at full capacity in our the local area and therefore the approval of this proposed development would place them under increased burden with no imminent proposals to alleviate the problem.

e) Further Proposed Developments

All the previous mentioned issues in items a) - d), mentioned above, do not take into consideration further proposed developments in close proximity, on Davenport Drive and Hewitts Circus of a possible further 300+ dwellings which directly impact and exacerbate all the above issues, increased traffic, increased public footfall, overloading of inadequate ageing drainage system and further overload to our public services.

f) Trees, Vegetation and Nature Conservation

This site may be referred to as overgrown waste land, it is the complete opposite, it's an area of natural wildlife, for both animal species and other organisms and is home to a plethora of wildlife which thrive and reproduce in the site's natural safety, deer, badgers, pheasants, foxes, kestrel, swift and countless species of wild birds and moths, not to mention any amphibian species and would therefore be of a great loss to the general public.

Furthermore, there should be no removal of the established trees and hedgerow on the Villa Court boundary

g) Incorrect Plans/Documents

It is apparent from the site layout and the plan showing the proposed access arrangement that one is incorrect, I am assuming the access arrangement, which will have an impact on the road junctions and crossing positions on Humberston Road.

How many other documents are incorrect or out of date ?

No characters left to comment on the negative impact of construction works on direct neighbours

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways , estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Kerry Chinn

Address: 6 Villa Court Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:OBJECTION

Firstly I would like to point out that not ALL persons whom this development application will affect have been notified following the correct procedures. Many local residents sharing the same post code have NOT received notification from NELC and this is extremely concerning.

* The proposed application , whilst reduces the proposal of 145 dwellings made in 2014 , still over populates the site and is not in keeping with the area . The possible 310 vehicles which have been accounted for by parking at the development , plus the inevitable additional traffic would cause untold disruption on what is already an extremely busy road. This is before we add into the equation the application already approved for the development at Hewitts Circus / Strawberry Fields adding a further 100 plus homes to this area. It would create extremely adverse conditions for highway safety and the free flow of traffic on Taylors Avenue / Hewitts Avenue / Humberston Road and Grimsby Road in addition to Weelsby Road, Clee Road and Lovelane Corner roundabout. Residents on Ashridge Drive would possibly also see an increase in vehicles using their access road as a short cut at times.

*Safe and suitable access cannot be achieved for the proposed number of users by placing the entrance / exit as is shown on the proposal. Access to the development is shown on the plans on what is a blind bend - this is not safe nor acceptable. My husband has made numerous calls and has been in correspondence already with NELC in regards the safety of this road over the last 2 years , particularly around the exact point of proposed access and the current speed limits.

*The site is referred to as wasteland / overgrown - I strongly disagree. The proposed site is an area of beautiful natural wildlife - for both animal species and other organisms. Any development on this particular site which has been open for decades and used consistently and without

objection, by the public, would mean a huge loss of ecological habitats and biodiversity and would negatively impact the historic environment heavily . Currently the site is home to a plethora of wildlife which thrive and reproduce in the site's natural safety - deer, badgers, pheasants, foxes, kestrel, swift, countless species of wild birds and moths - not to mention any amphibian species found in the ditch running to the south of the development - which I assume will have had relevant surveys done within specific time frames meeting current British Laws.

*Construction and the noise and disruption involved with this site proposal. so close to Weelsby Woods too , would disrupt untold amounts of wildlife in their breeding / nesting season(s) and beyond - some species may be driven away completely not to return.

*The site is home to a number of established self set trees, grasses and shrubs.

*Surface drainage from building on this site is also a concern for properties adjacent whom already currently suffer at times . I note rain gardens have been included in the proposals along with use of suitable materials on access roads / driveways etc but I fear these measures do not cover the huge excess which will be inevitable.

*Mains drainage for the number of houses would be an overload on an already aged system - noting too that residents of properties on Davenport Drive / Ashridge Drive currently using the proposed established drainage system on the application, haven't all even been made aware of this application so are unable to voice concerns.

*Noting proposed details of driveways, parking and access roads on the application plans - there is a concern that headlights from cars will be directed straight into existing properties windows on Villa Court, Ashridge Drive and Vaughan Avenue causing light pollution.

*The disruption and length of time anticipated on the proposed construction of this site would impact heavily on existing residents of the area. The heavy machinery required, number of persons involved , the dirt and waste created, air pollution and noise pollution too would severely and negatively impact quality of life.

*Already stretched education and health services running at capacity in the local area would be placed under further burden.

*Current established rights of ways from rear gardens in Vaughan Avenue and established borders must be taken into account.

* As Director of Villa Court Management Co, I do not permit for any trees / shrubs / fences / current border measures which are already established and formed to be destroyed or moved in the construction of this proposed site .

Therefore valid points of objection are as follows:-

Nature and Conservation

Traffic Management

Road Safety

Drainage

Logistics

Air / Noise / Light Pollution

Health and Education



9 Vaughan Avenue
Grimsby
North East Lincolnshire
DN32 8QB

The Planning Department
North East Lincolnshire Council
New Oxford House
2 George Street
Grimsby
DN31 1HB

6th July 2021

Dear Sirs

Objection to Planning Application Humberston Road Grimsby : DM/0552/21/FUL

I have already signed a petition in respect of the above. I have one point to raise and that is of a gated and established right of way from my rear garden into this area which my family and I have enjoyed for over 25 years. There is no notation of this and its acceptance on the proposed plan.

Yours faithfully

Anthony Bell

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways , estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Kerry Monument

Address: 13 Vaughan Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Having reviewed the previous applications documents from 2014 and in particular the comments from the Environment Agency on sustainable surface water management and their real concerns regarding surface water flooding. I see no real mitigations in the current application that would answer the Environment Agency's concerns around surface water management issues.

After the current heavy rainfall the field adjacent to the planned location is flooded to a depth of 5 inches of water and 2 days after the event is still flooded.

In addition what consideration has been given to local amenities and schools.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways, estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Archer

Address: Pantiles 15 Vaughan Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: While I agree with the submission from Mr Tony Bell. I am particularly concerned with the subject of the potential effects of surface water run off which can be a significant issue without this development and the development can only exacerbate this risk.

Firstly I draw attention to the serious concerns raised by the environment agency as referenced by Mr Kerry Monument at No13 Vaughan Avenue which do not appear to be adequately addressed.

Secondly I would like to submit my comment on the Flood Assessment as Follows:-

Comments on the submitted Flood risk assessment

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

Land off Humberston Road Grimsby

SITE LEVELS

The site covers an area of 4.8 hectares. The ground levels within the site boundary vary from 6.0m (Humberston Road) to 7.6m (south west boundary). The site level is generally around 6.0m AOD.

Despite being 6m AOD it is a basic heavy clay based valley sitting 2-3m below Vaughan Avenue in the North and a significantly high rise to the south. Therefore it is in effect a surface water run off for Vaughan Avenue as evidenced by the effective land drains in our gardens. Indeed the heavy rains this Wednesday 7th July has resulted in the current flooding of the subject land which is still extant today Friday 9th July.

SURFACE WATER

The surface water is to discharge into porous drives, swales and existing ditch running along the southern boundary.

This will maintain the surface water discharge on site in a sustainable approach.

Private drives will be constructed in porous paving to allow surface water to percolate laterally into the surrounding soft landscaped areas.

Clearly the land cannot cope with this rainfall before being effectively being concreted over, it seriously challenges the above suggested means to meet the task of coping with this significant surface water run off. Indeed as soakaways have been identified as unsuitable below it is difficult to envisage the above provision as being realistic

12.7 Drainage

12.7.1 The site is locally undulating with a steady fall of around 1m from east to west

Indicating that this valley is effectively flat thus it does not provide a natural run off

12.7.2 Based on observations made during the investigation, soakaways are very unlikely to provide a suitable drainage solution for surface water run-off at the site. Consequently, there is likely to be a need for surface water balancing.

Balancing ponds would be the most effective means

12.7.3 Any damage to the existing land drainage system caused by foundation or sewer excavations should be made good; this may require diversion and re-connection, several clay field drains were encountered during the site investigation

Any damage in connection with the above would have a significant impact on the properties in Vaughan Avenue

CONCLUSION

The site is 4.8 Ha in area and is classed as Brownfield.

A greenfield is an area of agricultural or forest land, or some other undeveloped site earmarked for commercial development, industrial projects or other construction projects. Conversely, a brownfield is an abandoned commercial development where hazardous substances or contaminants are typically present.

The proposed development is located in Zone 1 and is at low risk of flooding.

As stated above, given its location and position as an effective surface run off destination, it does regularly becomes waterlogged and is under water now

The British Geological Society website shows that the subsoils are likely to have high clay content that will be unsuitable for soakaways or infiltration techniques.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways , estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr sean olley

Address: 25 vaughan ave Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed properties No80 sideward facing our property. We have 2 large tree on our border which looks like it will impact on this property and their garden.

The question are:-

1. How have they not been picked up on the planning.
2. Will they impact the proposed property No80.
3. Will they have to be removed if planning is allowed.
4. Will it be my responsibility to maintain, even though the trees were there first and your development came later.

Everyone else in the avenue has a garden backing onto theirs from this development, except No25 and No27?

Looking from a side view of where these trees are, they would impede onto the proposed building.

I ask you to visit my garden and see what is proposed from our view.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0552/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0552/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Humberston Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 122 dwellings together with a sales suite, construction of garages, driveways , estate roads and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Tracey Whiting

Address: 25 Vaughan Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We have a number of concerns relating to the proposed development.

We have major concern with regard to the wide variety of wildlife that inhabits and travels through the area. There is a myriad of both ground and tree nesting birds. Deers, pheasants, foxes and badgers all frequent the area and would be displaced. We and the neighboring properties have open fences to allow their free movement, as this has long been a safe haven for wildlife, completely taken by nature. A rare oasis for wildlife and green space in the area.

Concern re flooding and the Impact of water that could be displaced onto our gardens, the water table is already high which often causes severe water logged areas.

Air and noise pollution from this number of houses and the associated vehicles would be a concern.

Increased traffic needing to enter Humberston road would add greater traffic congestion and increased difficulty to access the road, especially at peak times.

The estimated three years of noise and disruption whilst building followed by permanent disruption and pollution of such a densely populated estate would be a concern in a previously undeveloped green area.

From: Olivia Newell
Sent: 07 July 2021 17:17
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/0552/21/FUL

To whom it may concern

Please accept this as written confirmation that I oppose the planning application for the erection of 122 dwellings off Humberston Road.

Please keep me updated on the progress.

Regards
Olivia

Olivia Newell and Jack Fidlin

23 Hunsley Crescent
DN32 8PU

Carol Pedersen (Engie)

From: Hancock
Sent: 21 June 2021 17:37
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: Planning Application DM/0552/21/ful
Attachments: Annex swifts).docx

*The Limes
 Meer Booth Road
 Antons Gowt
 Boston
 PE22 7BG*

18/06/2021

Planning Department
 North East Lincolnshire Council
 New Oxford House
 2 George Street
 Grimsby
planning@nelincs.gov.uk

Dear Lauren Birkwood

Application reference: DM/0552/21/ful

Proposer: G Whall
 Address: Humberston Road Grimsby

I wish to comment on this planning application. **If your authority intends to grant permission for this planning application, I recommend you make installation of a minimum of 3 swift nest bricks per dwelling a planning condition to provide enhancement for biodiversity.**

Designing for and installing swift bricks into the fabric of the new buildings during the construction phase is easy, inexpensive, and will last the life-time of the buildings.

More information on integral nest sites and location guidance is in the annex.

Installing integral swift bricks would contribute to the objectives of the national legislation and planning policy set out below and demonstrate the commitment of your authority to protecting and enhancing biodiversity.

Section 40 of the **Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006^[1]**, states: “Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.”

This is supported by the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018**^[2] in **paragraph 175d**: When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: “..... opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged.”

Defra quote [response given to petition for protection of swift nests]:

“All local authorities have a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of their policy or decision making. As well as this duty, national planning policy states that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible. Specific biodiversity features, such as swift bricks, would normally be required of developments through either the relevant local plan or through the local authority’s development control team. ...”

May I respectfully point out that the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan SO6, Built, Historic and Natural Environment say, “ensures development needs are met in a way that minimises harm to the natural environment.”

Item 1 of Critical Success Factors, - “Safeguarding and protecting important species and their habitats,” and item 4, - “Delivery of net gains in biodiversity.”

The annex to this letter does point out the serious decline of swifts in recent years and in Boston for example the declines go even further mostly due to building and roof renovation or repair or even demolition. What the use of swift nest bricks is trying to do is establish a new stronghold for the birds by ensuring bricks are added to new buildings, renovated or extended buildings.

Yours sincerely

Barry Hancock

[1] http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/pdfs/ukpga_20060016_en.pdf

[1] <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

[1] http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/pdfs/ukpga_20060016_en.pdf

[2] <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Annex – swifts and built development

Why are swifts important?

Swifts are a quintessential sign of British summertime and an intrinsic part of our towns and cities. They are often seen soaring over rooftops on late summer evenings, with their dark sickle-shaped wings and distinctive ‘screaming’ calls. These charismatic birds spend nearly their whole lives in flight and are migrant birds, arriving all the way from central/southern Africa in early May just to breed in the UK, before leaving again in August.

However, swifts are in trouble, having declined by 57% between 1995-2017. Swifts are now an ‘Amber-listed’ species on the list of Birds of Conservation Concern¹.

Without our help, swifts will be lost as a breeding species in the UK

Swifts are entirely reliant on buildings to nest. Nest sites are being lost when buildings are demolished or refurbished - and because swifts are faithful to their nest site, breeding success of swifts is being severely affected. New buildings lack suitable nest cavities, hence the importance of providing integral nest sites during their construction. The RSPB and the British Trust of Ornithology believe loss of nest sites is a key driver behind the dramatic decline of swifts.

If we do not take action now to save swifts, future generations will not hear the exhilarating sound of screaming parties of swifts soaring over rooftops on a summer evening. With their loss, a part of our heritage will be lost with them too.

All is not lost, however. There are lots of simple and inexpensive solutions, easily deployed in all manner of developments which address the issue - swift nest bricks being one such example.

A range of possible solutions, products and resources is listed below.

Swift bricks

Nest bricks do not require maintenance or cleaning out, as swifts build an insignificant nest. Swifts also do not foul around their nest site; therefore a build-up of waste on a development is not an issue with nest bricks, making swifts the ideal tenants.

Swift bricks last the lifetime of the building and do not detract from its appearance. There are various designs of nest bricks on the market, suited to blend with the exterior of a building, thus not affecting its appearance. There are catalogues (eg *Facts about Swift Bricks*) available with dimensions of a range of products suitable to accommodate different design scenarios and constraints.

In new residential developments, a minimum overall ratio of one cavity per dwelling should be provided and ideally 2-4 nest chambers should be provided per suitable house. For example, in a 30-house development only 10 houses will each have 3 nest bricks located on a suitable gable.

Proportionally more may be added to commercial units.

Swift bricks should be positioned approximately 0.5-1m apart, close to the eaves or barge boards of gable ends, away from doors and windows. They must be installed with at least 5m clearance above ground and with a similar clear flight path in front. Ensure trees will not impede flight lines, including any new landscaping that may do so when mature. Orientation is not critical as internal nest bricks

¹ www.rspb.org.uk/birds-and-wildlife/bird-and-wildlife-guides/bird-guide/status_explained.aspx

are better protected against extremes of temperature. Although it is advised to avoid shaded, cold northerly aspects and cold 'wind tunnels' between houses.

Swift nest boxes

Occasionally integral nest bricks may not be appropriate for the design of the building (invariably metal clad commercial buildings). However, there are a range of external swift nest boxes available as an alternative. It is worth bearing in mind, however, that external boxes tend to have a finite life.

Ideally external nest boxes must be installed under an overhang or under the eaves, to ensure some protection from weather and heat. However, nest boxes exposed to the sun need to be constructed of thick enough materials to prevent overheating and possibly painted white.

As with swift bricks, they should be sited at least 5m off the ground, with no obstacles in front of the box, which will disrupt the flight path of a swift trying to gain access to the box (such as trees), or lead predators into the box (such as cables, or climbing plants).

Swift attraction calls

Occupation of nest boxes can be speeded up if a recording of the attraction calls of swifts is played to prospecting birds. Recordings on CDs & MP3s are available to purchase from Swift Conservation and Action for Swifts.

References

Exeter City Council (2010) 'Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document' Residential Design SPD chapters 9, 10 and Appendices. This is an exemplar of good practice guidance; Paragraph 9.28, page 58 and Appendix 2 are particularly relevant regarding integrating swift nest places into the fabric of buildings during construction.

<https://exeter.gov.uk/planning-services/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/residential-design-guide-spd/>

Town and Country Planning Association (2004) 'Biodiversity by Design: A Guide for Sustainable Communities'.

<http://urbed.coop/sites/default/files/Biodiversity%2520by%2520design.pdf>

RIBA Publishing & Bat Conservation Trust (2013) 'Designing for Biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings', 2nd Edition.

<http://www.ribabookshops.com/item/designing-for-biodiversity-a-technical-guide-for-new-and-existing-buildings-2nd-edition/79859>

Action for Swifts 'Facts about Swift bricks'.

<https://actionforswifts.blogspot.com/p/swift-bricks.html>

RSPB swift nest box

<https://ww2.rspb.org.uk/get-involved/activities/give-nature-a-home-in-your-garden/garden-activities/createahighhomeforswifts/>

Swift Conservation - swift box designs & attraction calls.

<http://www.swift-conservation.org/Shopping!.htm>

Action for Swifts - swift box designs.

<http://actionforswifts.blogspot.co.uk/p/diy-swift-box-designs.html>

Action for Swifts - attraction call system.

<http://actionforswifts.blogspot.co.uk/p/attraction-call-systems-for-swifts.html>

Action for Swifts - Residential bird box guidance

<https://actionforswifts.blogspot.com/p/rbbg.html>

Action for Swifts - The attitudes of housing occupants to integral bird and bat boxes

<https://actionforswifts.blogspot.com/2018/06/the-attitudes-of-housing-occupants-to.html>

Day, J., Mayer, E. and Newell, D. (2019). The Swift – A Bird You Need to Help! In Practice - Bulletin of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, 104: 38-42.

<https://actionforswifts.blogspot.com/p/rbbg.html>

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Rowena Lakin

Address: 8a Penshurst Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: By extending the cemetery you will be removing access to and use of a field used by many local people. Dog walkers, children, teenagers, mums on the school run....

The field over the years has already become smaller due to the school and school field being built.

This is the only green space for the people of Beacon Hill.

Can the old lower Lindsey school field, that is no longer in any use, be used for the extension instead.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Jo cumbes

Address: 44 penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: As a regular user of Trinity fields over the years I think it would be detrimental to the area should the cemetery be extended in to this area!

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Alan Camburn

Address: 59 penshurst rd Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Having lived in Penshurst Rd from 1959 for 21 years until I got married, I returned 20 years ago, one of the main reasons was Trinity fields, somewhere for my daughter to play safely and for us to exercise our dog. Does the council expect children local to the area to cross an extremely busy Taylors Ave to the playing field. Also after prolonged periods of rain, some of the properties backing onto the field, gardens flood as the field is higher than their gardens. Has the council factored in drainage and to what cost! What I can't understand, there is a perfectly good field where Lindsey Lower School used to be or is the council planning to sell it for housing to boost their coffers!!!

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Gemma Dick

Address: 64 Penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The field the proposed work is referring to is a public park that is used by many residents on the area including myself! It's not fair to those who use it for the work to go ahead and it's not fair to those whose back gardens lead onto the field, there is more value to the property to have a field behind rather than a cemetery.

I do not believe the work should go ahead. There is plenty more fields around the town that don't have gardens overlooking them.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Tanya Walton

Address: 74 penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I think it is absolutely disgusting that you are planning to take away a public field and what about the residents who in time to come may want to sell their house? Who wants to buy a house that overlooks a cemetery

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Tracy Wahwerit

Address: 82 penshurst rd Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I quite often use this to walk the family pet, surely the field of the old Lindsey school would be better.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Jessica Williams

Address: 87 penshurst Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The plans to lose our beloved field has deeply saddened me. I use this field twice daily to walk my dog or to take friends children for a safe place to be so they can be free. There are no longer many places for this anymore. Trin field strengthens our community as we all take care of it together. It's place where we have chance to take time out of our busy days and get to meet new people constantly.

I bought my house knowing that the field was a minute walking distance from my house. To be able to let my dog run free in an area like this if plans go forward I would then have to drive my dog to Taylor's avenue it's not practical. Also I don't want to look out my window and see graves. I also don't think it's right that you haven't consulted more of the surrounding area and I have found out through word of mouth. It will be a detrimental loss to our community

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Pamela Jackson

Address: 89 penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Lovely free space for families and dogs leave it alone

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Speight

Address: 105 Penshurst Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I want to object to the proposals of the extended cemetery. I live on Penshurst Road and I regularly utilise the thoroughfare passage that leads from Penshurst Rd on to the field. My access is for the purpose of taking my children to play football on the field. This is something we do on a regular basis, as we take a couple of goals and a football and spend hours there.

These developments would prevent me and my children from enjoying this precious time together. I understand the need to expand the cemetery, but surely the old Lindsey school field would be perfect for that purpose, as it is only used for the sole purposes of dog walkers. The Trinity fields are used for so much more, and therefore would have a much more significant impact if they were to be lost.

I do hope this decision is not being made based on commercial and financial reasons e.g. Housing being built on the Lindsey site instead.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Lee

Address: 106 Penshurst Rd Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Increased noise from construction. Then from digging of graves and associated noise from funerals.

How sure are you that there will not be any contamination from embalming fluid or medical drugs once the coffins decompose?

Is this a suitable location and will it be sufficient for future needs?

How sure are you that there is no significant Bronze Age funerary monuments are on the field. What tests have or will be carried out?

As the field as been used as a sports field for over five years I believe there is a statutory requirement to consult Sport England. As been carried out, if not when.

What will the impact on the physical and mental well-being of young people.

How will the flooding on the field after heavy rain be sorted out. Most if not all gardens on the Penshurst Road side are a good 18 to 24 inches below the field. What guarantee can be given that seepage of water will not cause problems to gardens.

Have you sort permission from Anglian Water in respect of their drainage pipes to dig near them.

How sure can you be that you have made an allowance for any potential rise in the water table. Remember the field floods.

The old lower Lindsey school field is a good area to use. Yes it slopes and as concrete on it, but

with all the ground works needed to build a cemetery this can easily be overcome.

With many homes having a gated access to the field what is the councils legal right to deny this

This field is used by the whole community.

Parents taking children to and from school. Having to go a different way will be a lot longer.

People going to shops. Having to go a different way will be a lot longer.

Users of Trin Centre Having to go a different way will be a lot longer.

Children and teenagers using the field for recreation and not on the streets causing trouble or involved in anti-social behaviour.

Dog walkers.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Anita Blissett

Address: 107 Penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Don't think it's right for school children to be able to see people being buried

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs michelle clayton

Address: 111 penshurst road cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: i object to the proposed planning for extension on the cemetery, the playing fields are a great place to take my children when there are not many around as it is, the road and such would devalue the houses in this area and cause more traffic and congestion

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Lesley Pickard

Address: 114 Penshurst Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I have lived here for 17 years (and previously before that my parents from 1959) and during this time, we have had repeated incidents of flooding with water coming off the field as we live at the bottom of the hill. If there is a tarmac road outside of my property boundary, this will significantly reduce the drainage and cause even more problems in due course. Are you going to revisit the flood risk assessment and ensure that adequate drainage is installed before any work commences otherwise I will be coming to the council for compensation. Other factors, privacy, the field is higher than my property and we will lose our right to quiet enjoyment. The owners were always told that the land was a green belt and nothing would be built on this land and this could also reduce the value of all the properties affected in the works. There will be noise and disruption with heavy machinery and building works. The locals use this field for their children to play on the playground, or the field and for walking their dogs in a secure environment which is a benefit to the community which we are going to lose.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Bullivant

Address: 120 penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The reason I decided to buy my house was because of the Greenland behind it where my kids could go out and play. For the council to allow a cemetery to be in place of the Greenland is a disgrace when there is a field on the old site where Lindsey lower school was which has been overgrown and an eye sore for years is a joke. Also it will affect the value of my house and also could be a problem for me to sell in the future

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Stephanie Owen

Address: 128 Penshurst Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The plans are to take over the majority of the playing field on which our property backs onto. We regularly open the back gate into the field for our child and dogs to play. This will bring down property prices as well as make for not such a nice view

From: Kevin Murray
Sent: 13 May 2021 20:49
To: Lauren Birkwood (Engie) <Lauren.Birkwood@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/0181/21/FUL

Dear Lauren

I am opposed to the changes proposed for the extension of Cleethorpes Cemetery onto Trinity Road fields. Currently the field is used as designed by the council as an area suitable for people to exercise and relax in a safe environment a number of years ago. Trees were planted and picnic style tables and benches installed for young and old to meet. The area is regularly used by dozens of people a day to walk dogs, entertain their children, socialise and as a children's play area.

In my opinion this area is perfect as it is and should remain so. Surely Beacon Avenue/Normandy Road is a far more suitable site for the cemetery extension.

Any changes to the field worry me on a number of issues;

- 1) security- if a fence is installed behind houses on Penshurst Road a long alleyway would be created. There has always been problems historically from the short alley behind Penshurst Road and Solomon Court, this would escalate.
- 2) there are very few areas for this part of Cleethorpes at present for people to have quality relaxing time, this would be one less.
- 3) as I mentioned in our conversation the only advantage of backing onto a cemetery is it is not the football pitches which would worry me greater. Problems with bad language (I have been to thousands of junior football matches) it's terrible to hear the parents. Damage to property ie fences, youths climbing over to retrieve lost footballs and take shortcuts through people's gardens which already happens.

I have been a resident of Penshurst Road for 43 years and am a proud resident of this neighbourhood.

I truly believe any change to Trinity field would be detrimental to the neighbourhood.

Kind regards

Kevin Murray
136 Penshurst

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Aaron Osborne

Address: 140 penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Community space!! Offers the community a playing park, dogs a place to exercise, the member of the community to exercise & play team sports.

Also devalue the house prices.. are you going to compensate for this!??

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Francesca Knight

Address: 140 penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Well used community space, including a park for children, dogs, sports recreation. No other nearby area to facilitate this.

Well needed in the community.

Also told when buying my property in 2015 the land behind would never be built on and would always remain as recreational.

Expanding the cemetery could easily devalue the house price.

Object to cemetery being expanded to the Trinity open space.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Laura Reed

Address: 142 Penshurst Road Lincolnshire Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I have just read the proposed times for the demolition of this was to go ahead, no work before 8am and after 6pm and 1pm on a weekend. What about those that work nights. My husband does and our bedroom is at the back of the house that backs onto the field. There are a lot of people down Penshurst that work nights.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Laura Reed

Address: 142 Penshurst Road, Lincolnshire Lincolnshire Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: It says the decision for this should have been made by the 12th July. Do we know when the decision will be made and if it goes ahead when will the properties backing on to the field find out

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Laura Reed

Address: 142 Penshurst road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: My house backs on to the field and by the looks of the plan a fence is going to be right up against my fence and then a road. I think it is a disgrace that you want to use this open space. Children from the area have very little open space as it is and this field is full of children using it to run around play football fly kites and just generally have fun. I have lived here for over 3 years and we have never had trouble from the children / teenagers they just have fun. If this space has gone what are the children going to do then.

When we bought the house we were told that as it was an open space, houses could not be built on it. We purchased the house as we liked the fact we had a field behind us and don't think we would have purchased the house if it had looked out onto a grave yard. I hope that this won't effect the price of our house and the potential of a sale if we ever did want to sell. I don't understand why you can't extend it over the other side at the back of the nursing home that field is not being used or are you planning on selling that to build houses on therefore making a profit for the council. How long is the work going to last, my husband works nights and our bedroom backs onto the Field it is going to be very noisy and dirty. I want to enjoy my garden this summer not hear building works I highly disagree with the extension of the cemetery.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Sarah Burton

Address: 31 Thoresby Place Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: It's ridiculous!!! Primary school kids don't need to be seeing people being buried and the grieving families don't want to be hearing kids running around and screaming while trying to bury their loved ones

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Donna Washington

Address: 93 Curzon Avenue Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Reuse the oldest part of the cemetery, do not take away children's green space.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Charlotte Jones

Address: 42 Thrunscoe Road 42 Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This field is used by all ages for social and leisure activities, it also backs onto a primary school. My son personally uses this field to play football etc with friends, it makes for a useful cut through to school for many too. My other son attends the school this field backs onto, I don't think burials are something primary school children need to be seeing all day everyday. I also don't think those mourning the loss of a loved one would want to hear children playing meters away! It's a ridiculous idea all round and takes away a great community space that's well loved and used.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Abby Smith

Address: 171 Sandringham Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Myself and my partner were very disappointed to receive notice of these plans and we strongly object to them. The fields are used all year round by many families, children and dog walkers. We can look out onto the fields at any time and can guarantee to see children playing (often times bringing goals etc. to play football) as well as people walking with their dogs or just getting outdoors. The playing fields are incredibly important and taking this away would be devastating for the area.

If built, the cemetery would also directly abut our back garden and we are of course concerned that this could affect house values notwithstanding that certain future buyers would be put off purchasing a house that overlooks a cemetery.

As others have mentioned, the logical place for an extension to the cemetery would be the unused fields at the former Lindsey school.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Thomas Brett

Address: 179 sandringham road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I live on Sandringham road and back on to the Trinity open space, there have been on going talks throughout the years about extending the graveyard and every single person I have spoke to in regards to this has objected. There is a section of land attached to but gated off from the main field that would be ample space to extend the grave yard but to take the whole field away from the children (who I see use every single day) and the residents that use the field to walk their dogs, play football and use as a nice walk. It's one of Cleethorpes last remaining pros in the area. Having spoken to many people we've all agreed that the best place would be to have the new cemetery would be the field opposite Cleethorpes academy on Taylor's avenue. Here there would be no neighbours that it would effect and would be a nice addition rather than stealing the beautiful park that is Trinity open space. Please consider that pretty much nobody wants this to happen unless you're taking the space that is gated off from the park and field.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Sophia Sarbutt

Address: 201 Sandringham Rd Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Trinity Open Space is a vital part of our community. In an age of children being stuck inside playing computer games it is nice to see them and their families making use of the park and playing field daily. Mental health has declined rapidly, for our younger generations especially. Contact with the natural environment is essential for good mental wellbeing.

I am also sure mourners at the proposed cemetery would not appreciate the noise that is associated with the park and football pitch.

There is also the concern of increased traffic to the area with having quite a few schools located near by.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Shane Mawer

Address: 201 sandringham road Sandringham road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The loss of the playing field will have a significant impact on the surrounding neighbourhood as this green space is used by many families for various outdoor activities.

This green space allows walkers to use the field to safely walk away from traffic and have an opportunity to refresh their minds, which was especially vital during lockdown and allowed many of the community to improve their mental health.

Another concern is the fact the remaining park and football pitches will become within close proximity of the cemetery. This raises concerns on noise nuisance from football games and also people using the park. Families who are mourning may not appreciate this type of background noise during hard times.

Young children should also be protected from the potential on seeing a funeral process whilst playing within a park.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Bradley Campling

Address: 205 Sandringham Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: In my opinion the current access roads/ entrances/ exits for the cemetery are not fit for purpose due to limited visibility and narrow access roads. I have witnessed numerous near misses over the years from people exiting the cemetery via the entrance opposite Mill road and Normandy road respectively. The extension of the cemetery is only going to increase traffic demand on the area, ultimately increasing the likelihood of an accident.

Another consideration is the field often suffers with poor drainage in the winter months and standing water. It has seen a stork utilise the standing water whilst there, over the past few years among other wildlife which is active in the field which will be disturbed by the construction/ development.

The site behind the former Lindsey school has been unused since the school closed around 10-15 years ago and seems the logical location as it is not a currently utilised space unlike Trinity open space.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Marcus Sheard

Address: 213 Sandringham Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: It's disgusting to build on community space where kids play and people take dogs. I am also concerned about house prices

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Christine England

Address: 11 Arundel PLace Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Lindsey fields was earmarked for cemetery, not housing. OAPs in battery cars with dogs, kids playing football, families picknicking, all take place on Trinity OS on a daily basis. I walk my dog there and have made many friends. There is other land available for housing - please don't take our open space away, use Lindsey fields for the cemetery. There will be deaths if you leave us no choice but to cross Taylors Ave to the next open space.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Amy Hubbard

Address: 40 Hope Street Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This space is currently a valued part of the community. Areas like parks and public's fields are getting fewer and fewer.

The proposed would ruin the value of surrounding properties, and remove a safe place for young people to play.

Although I appreciate the need for the proposed, there must be another area that could be converted without impacting the community.

Fully object to this.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Corrine Barry

Address: 8 The Mount Mill Road CLEETHORPES

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: As a local member of the public who uses the trinity playing field on a Regular basis I whole heartily object to this proposal. There is already a limited amount of safe open spaces for locals to enjoy. The recent pandemic has show us the Importance of being able to exercise and enjoy outside space not only for fitness but also mental health reasons.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Charlotte Rendall

Address: 106 Yarborough road Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This field is used by so many and would be a great loss to the community as one of the only remaining open spaces in the area. There is an unused field at the former Lindsey school which would be more suitable.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Hollingworth

Address: 106 Yarborough road Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This would be a great loss to the community as one of the only remaining open spaces in the area. Why can't this be built on the unused field at the former Lindsey school.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Sarbutt

Address: 44 Park Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the plans. The park / fields are an essential part of the local community.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Miss Jasmine Williams

Address: 44 Park Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I disagree to the proposed plan as the area is currently a benefit to the local community and youth.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0181/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0181/21/FUL

Address: Trinity Road Playing Fields Trinity Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Extension to Cleethorpes Cemetery to include access road and associated works

Case Officer: Lauren Birkwood

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Alison Sarbutt

Address: 34 Peaks Avenue New Waltham

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This field is used widely by the community. Local children use it to play and exercise, something that should be encouraged by having more open spaces not taking them away.



Humberston Parish Council

Clerk to the Council – Kathy Peers Telephone 07494 577661
e-mail 'clerk@humberstonparishcouncil.com'

TO: planning@nelincs.gov.uk

Planning Consultation Comments

19th February 2020

Dear Sirs,

The Parish Council considered the following applications at its meeting held on Tuesday 18th February 2020 and wishes to submit the comments as shown:

Planning Application Reference: DM/0887/19/FUL

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage (Amended plans February 2020)

Location: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston

The Parish Council has objections to this application. The Parish Council believes that there is now enough provision locally for new housing development and NELC has reached its housing numbers target. The Parish Council would therefore ask NELC to consider and adopt a policy seeking to preserve the character of this area and refuse any further infill development going forward.

The Council would support neighbours with objections to this scheme on grounds of over intensification of this area of the Avenue, with access a major issue to this particular site, especially with regard to emergency vehicles – the Fire Service has confirmed it would not be able to access homes in this location. Overall the development has a detrimental impact upon the character of Humberston Avenue and adds to over intensive development in this area of the Village which is not required.

Yours faithfully,

KJ Peers

KJ Peers

Clerk to the Council

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



Humberston Parish Council

Clerk to the Council – Kathy Peers

TO: planning@nelincs.gov.uk

Planning Consultation Comments

6th November 2019

Dear Sirs,

The Parish Council considered the following applications at its meeting held on Tuesday 5th November 2019 and wishes to submit the comments as shown:

/over....

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

Planning letter continued....

Planning Application Reference: DM/0887/19/FUL

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Location: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston

The PC notes residents' concerns at the development site particularly with regard to the right of access of neighbouring properties and would ask the Planning Committee to consider this issue and whether the development could be classed as over-intensification of this plot of land.

Yours faithfully,

KJ Peers

Clerk to the Council

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



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

18th February 2021

Dear Sirs,

The Parish Council considered the following applications at its virtual meeting held on Wednesday 17th February 2021 and wishes to submit the comments as shown:

Planning Application Reference: DM/0887/19/FUL

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage (Amended plans - access arrangements Jan 2021)

Location: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston

No objections.

Yours faithfully,

KJ Peers

KJ Peers

Clerk to the Council

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

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Tony Woods

Address: 25 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This application would be over intensify the site and would have to be crammed in and would be overbearing on the other properties.

there would be an adverse effect on the trees on the site.

The access lane is very narrow and could cause safety issues.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage (Amended plans February 2020)

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Eileen Thorley

Address: 37 Humberston Ave Humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: From studying the plans for the proposed property clearly the access road is inadequate to allow further development on this land. The entrance to the driveway is 3.1m which Building Regulations stipulate, however within a very short distance this narrows down considerably. All emergency services would have difficulty accessing not only the proposed property but also 41A.

How will access and exit be maintained for 41A whilst the essential services are being laid to the proposed property?

Already there are problems re drainage and sewerage in this area. thus further development would add to this. Removing mature trees is not environmentally friendly.

A 2 storey building would impact on the privacy of the surrounding properties which are of single storey apart from the original properties 39 and 41 which front Humberston Ave and are a good distance from 39A and 41A.

This 4 bed property (a family home) has an attached double garage and the passing/parking bay is immediately in front. Surely this could be problematic. How can it be guaranteed that the vehicles belonging to the residents of the proposed property are always parked in the garage, it seems obvious there will be many occasions when their vehicles are parked in the passing bay. Consequently visitors or tradesmen will park their vehicles over the turning/passing area or in the access road thus obstructing access and exit for the resident of 41A.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mrs ANGELA PHILLIPS

Address: 39 humberston ave GRIMSBY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object strongly to this application to build in back garden land - due to the poor access on to the main road - re observation is limited at the junction on onto the main road.

This proposed build destroys the privacy of adjoining properties - is out of the building line. Would put even further pressure on main drainage which is already poor in the surrounding properties -

several properties are already using the access to their properties and this further property would even more pressure as there is no "passing point" in the alley way.

Dated 11th February 2020

For the attention of Mr Limmer

c/o Engie

DM/0887/19/FUL – Amended plans February 2020

I would like to reiterate my objection to this proposal as a four bedded 1.5 storey dwelling in my opinion amounts to an over-development and over-intensification of a piece of garden land.

Scores of four bedded properties are being built to the two major developments to Humberston Avenue. I believe this dwelling is not necessary in the current climate and detracts from the amenity of the original host house (as 41 is a large detached property like mine and benefits from having a suitably sized rear garden which acts to compliment the property). I also believe this development diminishes the amenity to other properties in close proximity to it due to running the risk of changing the character to this part of the Avenue.

An Engie Case Officer previously made this comment in 2016 in a Delegated Report in relation to another application DM/0870/16/OUT. "Residential development on Humberston Avenue is varied in design, style and scale. However, properties are generally located within spacious, mature garden plots." The Case Officer was referring to a property situated more easterly to the Avenue but I would like to see much greater parity being applied to decision-making to the Avenue in general. Presently the host property at 41 and garden size tends to mirror mine. If the applicant is allowed to fragment the plot, clearly this will no longer be the case. I would like to query how anyone could view this as good design and therefore fundamentally compatible with "good design principles to new developments" as per the Local Plan and broadly within National Planning Policy Framework?

I am concerned about the access road recognising it is too narrow for a Fire Engine to be able to get down. I feel this aspect also highlights that this proposal is indeed of poor design.

Over the years I have witnessed this piece of garden land flood consistently and heavily. Should the proposal ultimately be granted, I would ask that the ground level is not raised as I believe it could have a negative impact upon my garden land/property going forward.

I also struggle to see an adequate turning area on the plans. Where will people such as the post man and delivery drivers who use vans park and turn safely? I feel going forward parking issues and inadequate turning facilities will create problems and obstructions for the resident who lives at 41A. Should there be an increase to parking to this part of Humberston Avenue, this too will cause obstruction problems as there is a bus stop in close proximity to the access road.

ANGELA PHILLIPS

39 HUMBERSTON AVENUE, HUMBERSTON, DN36 4SW

Becca Soulsby

From: Richard Limmer (Engie)
Sent: 24 February 2020 16:00
To: Becca Soulsby
Subject: FW: Boundary and Flooding Pictures
Attachments: 1.jpg; 2.jpg; 3.jpg; 4.jpg

DM/0887/19/FUL

Hi,

Could you pop this comment on the file along with the photos

Thank you

Richard

Richard Limmer MSc URP
 Major Projects Planner
 Planning and Development Team
 Places & Communities North – NEL



Working in Partnership

engie.co.uk

New Oxford House, George Street
 Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire, DN31 1HB

From: MARK CARRIE
Sent: 24 February 2020 15:51
To: Richard Limmer (Engie)
Subject: Boundary and Flooding Pictures

Good afternoon Richard,

As discussed photographic images of the consistently flooded rear garden land to property number 41 Humberston Avenue, Humberston. T

Also I have confirmed with my solicitor the boundary between 39A and 41, which the developer at 41 plans to build upon, belongs to 39A. Therefore he will not have the necessary space to locate the garage as per the plans on the application or have permission to remove any trees or hedging within that boundary.

Kind regards

Mark Carrie (39A)





Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr mark carrie

Address: 39A humberston avenue humberston grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Re Highway safety concern

Although we have raised issues in relation to the working viability of the turning area and passing place in earlier comments and the importance of vehicles being able to exit in forward gear, we would like to point out opposite to the access road is a bus stop.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Deborah Carrie

Address: 39A humberston avenue humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We would like to submit the following comments in relation to our objection to this particular application. These comments relate to DM/0426/17/OUT. However we believe they are highly relevant to this situation given the design and loss of amenity the proposed dwelling would create, especially so, given the current amenity the immediate surrounding properties experience in this part of the Avenue too.

The proposed dwelling would result in a cramped and incongruous form of development that would be out of keeping with the established character and appearance of this part of Humberston Avenue, and as such conflict with saved Policies GEN1 and H10 of the saved North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2003 and Policies 1, 2 and 20 of the Submission North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2016).

1. The proposal would therefore fail to address the principles of good design set out within the National Planning Policy Framework and local planning policy.

2 The relationship of the proposed development with existing land uses would result in an unsatisfactory relationship in terms of securing a good standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings contrary to saved Policy GEN1 and H10 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2003 and Policies 1, 2 and 20 of the Submission North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2016). The proposal would therefore fail to address the principles of good design set out within the National Planning Policy Framework and local planning policy.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Deborah Carrie

Address: 39A Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I would like to comment/object that I am concerned about the level of parking spaces that have been allocated to the proposed development. This is a four bedded property (suitable for a family) and it appears to have been allocated only two parking spaces which I would suggest is insufficient for the needs of a modern family. As such, if a back land development has insufficient levels of allocated parking to meet the needs of the inhabitants (these days families can own three or four motor cars as well as a work vehicle such as van) going forward I suggest there would be an increased likelihood of residents parking over turning areas and possibly the actual access road itself leading to obstruction for other home owners (in this case to number 41a). If parking does occur on the turning area (as a consequence of limited availability of parking spaces to the property) there will be an increased likelihood of visitors to the home reversing out of the access road rather than exiting in forward gear. As such this scenario presents a serious safety risk. The issue of insufficient parking spaces to tandem/linear style back land dwellings, such as this, applies not only to residents but visitors to the dwelling too. If back land developments do not have the necessary parking spaces for visitors to the home, similarly there could be a temptation for visitors to park over the turning area or partially obstruct the access road. The other option for residents and visitors to back land developments in this area would instead be to park on Humberston Avenue itself. However this too is less than ideal given Humberston Avenue experiences a heavy traffic flow (which in all likelihood will continue to increase in levels given the amount of development occurring to the area) and as a negative consequence lead to increased levels of congestion. Having increased levels of parking to Humberston Avenue will also run the risk of obscuring the driver's view as they exit the access road therein creating a further road safety issue in itself. With regards to this specific application the matter is further compounded by the close proximity of a bus stop to the other side of the road.

Given the above factors, it is my assertion parking allocation to linear style back land developments in Humberston Avenue warrants extra special consideration, arguably so to a far

greater degree, than a proposed dwelling sitting in full view on an adopted road where the management of road safety issues is much more readily achievable.

It is my understanding there is no longer a set standard for parking provision of two vehicles for new developments to villages due to the adoption of the Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018) specifically Policy 38 Parking Provision.

Extracts taken from the Local Plan support my comments:

14.170 Parking can present problems when it is not considered as part of an integrated design approach, or when too little parking is provided relative to the local site circumstances.

14.171 Much evidence now exists to suggest that the over-restriction of residential parking approach taken by local authorities in response to Planning Policy Guidance 3: Housing (PPG3), has had a negative impact on highway safety and good urban design.

14.172 It is important to ensure future developments provide sufficient parking that will not result in on-street parking congestion.

As such, in terms of this application given it relates to a linear style back land development, I would like to respectfully request additional parking provision is considered on and above the current level being proposed.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Deborah Carrie

Address: 39A Humberston avenue Humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Please can the width of the access road to the proposed dwelling be established as it appears to measure less than the gateway width of 3.1m as stipulated in the Building Regs Part B5.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Deborah Carrie

Address: 39A Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I would like to object on the following grounds:

Over-intensification

Presently a symmetry exists as the dwellings, being 41 and 41a, appear to "share" the total plot in a design sensitive 50/50 split. Adding an additional dwelling to the rear garden of number 41 divides up the total area in a noticeably uneven manner.

Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would appear overbearing/dominating for surrounding properties due to it being sited in rear garden land, particularly so, as it is so close to existing boundary lines (given the small amount of garden land available as shown on the block design).

Historically permission to build a dwelling on this piece of garden land was refused, with one of the reasons cited as noise and disturbance to number 41a, the rear property. Albeit the refusal occurred a number of years ago, this aspect, is still as pertinent and relevant to present day considerations. The proposed terraced area will be very close to the boundary. Noise from this area will readily emanate from inside the dwelling such is the open plan nature of the design, as well as from the actual outside terrace area itself. Noise and disturbance will also be a factor for our property number 39a, as well as for number 39, and therefore not exclusively for 41a.

The proposed plot is too small for a 1.5 storey dwelling of the suggested size. Given the design only has small strips of garden surrounding the property; the dwelling will appear "shoehorned in". The proposed dwelling will be noticeably dissimilar proportionally to those in close proximity to the size of neighbouring dwellings in terms of the build to plot ratio. All the surrounding properties sit within plots of .4 of an acre plus. When I purchased my property, I had the option of purchasing numerous four bedded properties on small sized plots, with proportionally small gardens. These types of dwellings were readily available on various developments in the immediate area and generally within the locality. One can argue they are still readily available, due to it being the

preferred option for the modern day developer. I chose not to purchase the latter as part of the appeal for me centred on buying a property that sat within a good sized garden; which was also sited among surrounding properties that too were proportionally all of a generous and sensitive dwelling to plot ratio. The application being proposed changes this aspect resulting in negative impact upon the charm and ambiance of the immediate area that surrounds my property.

It is my opinion adding the proposed dwelling to the garden land fragments the existing plot and compromises the current dwelling's character. This is such a shame, especially so, as the type of potential dwelling being suggested is much more readily found in plentiful numbers elsewhere within the area; rather than the more highly regarded existing one, whose plot under current plans would unfortunately undergo a detrimental compartmentalisation.

Positioning of the garaging

I would respectfully like to suggest the area earmarked for a dwelling is insufficient for this purpose and would possibly better suit garaging. If garages are situated within the rear area, they could be single storey and therefore less overbearing than a 1.5 high storey dwelling. Additionally, this would remove the need for garages to be placed to the front of No. 41, negating the need for garaging overlooking the Avenue from this property.

Tree Loss

There will be a permanent loss of three mature trees on the site. Due to the proposed limited size of the plot, it will not be possible to plant three new replacement trees elsewhere on it. On the land to number 43, a number of trees run adjacent to the access road. These are magnificent specimens and I concur with the views recorded by the Trees and Woodlands Officer in order to secure their future well-being.

Access

It is imperative this proposed application (along with application DM/0851/19/FUL) takes into consideration the access needs of the resident who lives at number 41a, during any building works and also afterwards, especially so as it is the only means of entering and exiting his property. Additionally it is unacceptable for the resident of 41a to experience any disruption to his services. Although a passing place is suggested on the plans, the access road is narrow, and I seek assurance the passing place is of a sufficient width to be workable in practice. In addition to this, I am uncertain the proposed design currently has an adequate turning area. If not, vehicle users such as visitors to the property/delivery drivers will unfortunately run the risk of exiting the access road not in forward gear. Having vehicles potentially reversing onto Humberston Avenue would be an unacceptable highway safety risk. An issue recently flagged up in relation to an application on Humberston Avenue in near proximity to this one.

Deborah & Mark Carrie

39a Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr mark carrie

Address: 39A humberston avenue humberston grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Given the sewerage system will serve a number of homes being number 41 (who were previously given permission by number 41a to tap into the drainage system and which is located within the access road), number 41a and the proposed infill property will all utilise the same sewerage system going forward if the proposal is successful. Number 41a is significantly raised from ground level and does not have a pumping system and therefore relies on gradient for sewerage flow. It is concerning any extra demand on the drains may cause problems going forward and, as such, can a request please be made that in terms of possible future works the drains are constructed in a manner that meet highways standards.

Given the access road is narrow and will serve more than one household can we request appropriate street lighting also meets highways standards with cost implications for both aspects, drains and lighting, borne by the developer. We would also like to re-iterate any works carried out to the access road need to ensure the resident's ability to access/exit his property and also, have access to emergency services in terms of continuity, are not affected or disrupted (7 days a week, 24 hrs).

We would like to request, should permission be granted for the infill property, that a one storey property would be more in-keeping than the proposed 1.5 storey property due to overlooking, dominance issues and loss of privacy leading to an impact upon amenity for the one storey surrounding properties. Although 41 and 39 which overlook the Avenue, are two storey properties, all other properties surrounding the proposed infill property are one storey developments. We would like to request, given this is a rear garden land development and therefore of a particularly sensitive nature to those existing dwellings in close proximity, this too should be a one storey dwelling only. Making it one storey will help ensure it is more in-keeping and less dominating.

There is a comparable argument contained within the refusal to the recent application DM/0633/19/FUL. Albeit this particular refusal refers to two storey dwellings there is nevertheless a relevant comparison if joined up thinking is applied, "The physical impact of this would be emphasised by the two storey scale of the properties and their proximity to the site boundaries. This is also evident by the narrow site access and the limited amount of rear garden space provided for each dwelling. This is in stark contrast from Humberston Avenue, where the character is depicted typically by large detached dwellings within spacious, mature gardens. Thus, the proposal would be detrimental to the character of the area, contrary to Policy 5 of the NELLP. We would argue this too applies to this application.

We have raised concerns over the adequacy of the passing place in earlier comments. Please cross reference these concerns against the same recent refusal (DM/0633/19/FUL) again we suggest there is a parallel argument to be made here, "This lane is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass and this could create a conflict between a number of cars entering and leaving the site: at the junction with the adopted highway, to the detriment of highway amenity and safety."

In terms of the infill property we recommend ground levels should not be raised. We have witnessed this area of rear garden land recently flood extensively, hypothetically if ground levels are raised, this could cause flooding to surrounding grounds in 41a, 39 and 39a. A high level of scrutiny should therefore be applied to the viability of the soak away being suggested. In addition, as suggested, the existing layout appears to be overdeveloped for the plot size which results in little amenity for the dwelling.

Of paramount importance is previous application DM/0426/17/OUT and subsequent appeal decision (site visit 5.2.2018) ref: APP/B2002/W/17/3187041. Author David Cross an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

We would like to argue aspects of points 4,5,6 and 10 are relevant to this application and should therefore be taken into account in relation to decision making on this application.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage (Amended plans February 2020)

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Mark Carrie

Address: 39A humberston avenue humberston grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Our objections to the amended plans:

Previously a proposal to build a one storey property to this piece of garden land was refused. At appeal the objection was upheld. Grounds for refusal included: the plot being made triplicate (divided into three), noise, disturbance and access issues. We are of the opinion these aspects are still relevant to the present day. In fact, the access issue is more problematic (due to the property having been extended over the building line on to the access road) and therefore is actually more limited than it was at the time of the appeal.

This part of Humberston Avenue (specifically the properties to all aspects of 41 including those sitting directly opposite to the south side of the Avenue) have spacious mature gardens which help define the character of the area. The size of the garden for this proposed development would not be in-keeping with those that are in proximity to it. The proposed development would also diminish the garden land and therefore the amenity of the large detached host property. As such, 41 would no longer mirror number 39, it's neighbouring property, in terms of garden to build proportions that it sits adjacent to.

We feel allowing a 1.5 storey property to be built to this part of the Avenue, to back land, sets a negative precedence as the existing back land properties and others surrounding it are only one storey.

Good design should not only centre on a proposed build using in-keeping building materials but also functionality. Whilst the access road to this property does not meet the Building Regulation requirements in terms of access for a Fire Engine going forward there will also be additional issues in terms of a lack of functionality. By way of example, future owners wishing to have their household items brought to their home via a furniture removal van will find it is not readily achievable due to the access limitations. We do not feel this proposed development constitutes Good design in new developments as per the principles of the adopted Local Plan. We fail to see

the need for its permission, given its limitations, when so many properties are being built in close proximity to the Avenue that meet design functionality to a far greater extent.

The amended plans do not provide details of where the car parking spaces have been allocated within the design. Should future residents park two vehicles to the front of the garaging, it appears in order to exit the property in forward gear, would necessitate the need to reverse on to the access road. We notice on other applications a Swept Path Analysis has been conducted and would respectfully request in order to ensure safety and design functionality is achievable with regards to this issue, the proposed design would benefit from this type of measure.

Finally we have concerns about the level of flooding that occurs to this piece of garden land and have submitted photographic evidence of this accordingly.

For the attention of Mr R Limmer

C/O Engie

Application number: DM/0887/19/FUL

41 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Dear Mr. Limmer,

As you are aware the services to my home run inside the access road including fresh and fowl water services. I am very worried that these may become damaged or disrupted during any future building works and have been talking with an advisor at Anglian Water called Jonathan Hardy accordingly.

Mr. Hardy has advised that Anglian Water will gladly become involved if asked to do so even at this stage of planning.

They have indicated this process can be started if you as Case Officer initiate a contact/request to them via:

planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk and quote the application reference of DM/0887/19/FUL

Accordingly, they will then look at this matter.

I would be extremely grateful if you could do this please as I very much believe the services to my home were not laid particularly deeply within the ground when they were originally sited.

Kind regards

Ron Horner

41A Humberston Avenue

Dated 31st January 2020



For the attention of Mr Richard Limmer, Case Officer

41 Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Application: DM/0887/19/FUL

I would like to respectfully request that should planning be granted in respect of the dwelling a condition should be added that the developer places a screen of trees (not a hedge as this would not be high enough and a hedge cannot be protected in a residential garden) not on the boundary line itself but on the developer's land between the proposed dwelling and my property 41A . A condition or TPO should be placed on the trees to ensure they are protected going forward and therefore a permanent fixture. I would ask the developer covers this cost. This act would help to screen the side elevation of the proposed dwelling. Given my lounge would face the side elevation, in time, it would help to soften the look of the dwelling and assist my outlook.

By completing this course of action it would help to offset the negative impact upon the environmental aspect due to the several trees he is removing from the plot in order to build the dwelling being replaced by new ones.

Please add to my comments.

Ron Horner

41A Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Dated 5th November 2019

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage (amended site layout plan July 2021)

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Chapman

Address: 41a Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Date: 13/08/2021

Planning application reference: DM/0887/19/FUL

Case officer: Richard Limmer

Stance: Object

Having recently moved into 41a Humberston Avenue at the end of July, there has been limited time to review this application in part due to timescales but also due to a visible lack of planning notification in the area for this application and were only notified by the previous owners on immediately prior to completion, hence our decision to object to the current proposed plan.

Our initial thoughts were that of surprise and disappointment that a building plot (let alone a 4 bed dorma bungalow) in the rear garden of 41 would be either realistic, achievable or in-keeping with the surrounding area. This plot would immediately neighbour our front boundary which is currently a private and secluded garden space with tree preservation orders in the vicinity.

Having considered the impact to us and others in our proximity in relation to this planning application and the proposed plan we would like to cite our areas of concern for your consideration. Some of the reasons discussed have been previously cited by other surrounding occupants in the area from reading the comments via the online portal. Our concerns are in part due to lack of time to consider the appropriate evidence or have any level of discussion surrounding these with the proposer (for which we apologise).

Access represents one of our primary concerns owing to our job roles at the hospital where we require 24-hour access to the property due to shift patterns and on call responsibilities (where there is a mandated response time for urgent and critical care patients). Although alterations to the driveway width have been proposed there is still limited space, not allowing for 2 cars adjacent to pass on the driveway access to 41a and the proposed development. This is in part due to a potential pinch point where the current access appears to have been built over by a previous extension of 41. In view of the size of the 2 properties for 41a and the development (both family sized homes), the traffic accessing both properties for the residents and their visitors is expected to be chaotic and any emergency services requiring access the properties will have their response impaired.

An additional concern exists as to volume of traffic with any visitors, deliveries or building vehicles to the proposed building. This has potential to block or restrict our access with the inevitability of others requiring access to our grounds in order to turn large vehicles round due to limited space on the access driveway (even with proposed alterations) and the driveway of the development itself within the boundary of the proposed site. The need for vehicles to reverse down the narrow driveway onto the Humberston Avenue could occur representing a potential risk.

It remains unclear as to the impact of the proposed gate on the plans for the shared access driveway. Namely the mechanics and the maintenance of this, should it not be in working order at any time. At this stage it is not clear if foot access is possible should that be the case for any person or emergency service worker wishing to access 41A or the proposed development.

Services to 41a were specifically built with a gradient to optimise the drainage system and concerns exist that another property accessing and linking into our drains on our right of access driveway could impact this detrimentally.

One of the attractions of purchasing 41A was the views, nature and sparsity of development around and so the impact of a property immediately facing our front garden in such close proximity represents a further concern with respect to privacy, noise and outlook. Although we understand the 1st floor window would look out towards neighbouring properties the proposed outdoor area would be in close proximity and could create additional noise/disruption. We would expect that the boundary is well preserved by a bank of trees additional to what is currently proposed to maintain the bespoke qualities of this area that drew us to purchase 41A in the first instance.

We would echo the comments made by surrounding occupants on the portal and from the previous owner who had similar reservations. We note applications were previously declined due to access issues, over intensification, noise and disruption to neighbours and conclude that little has changed to that end other than two large development sites on Humberston Avenue itself. This raises the question of why more housing is required in the immediate locality and given the house to plot ratio for this proposed development.

Thank you for your consideration

Emily McIntosh and Paul Chapman
41A Humberston Avenue



Mr R Horner

41A Humberston Avenue

Humberston, Grimsby

NE Lincolnshire

Date: 21.10.2019

For the att of Mr Richard Limmer

Planning application DM/0887/19/FUL

I object to this application on a number of grounds as follows:

There is a restrictive covenant in my house deeds that states no more than two houses can be built on this total plot. There are two properties being 41 and 41a on the total plot currently.

Adding a further dwelling is an inappropriate proposal as it would look squeezed in at the end of number 41's garden due to the limited space available. It would spoil the character and charm of the immediate surroundings.

An application was previously refused to which I also objected. Planning was refused then due to the issue of noise and disturbance to my property. If a dwelling is built there, noise and disturbance would still be an issue and a concern to me.

The access road to my property (which I have a legal right to) is my only means of access to my property. I object to building works taking place that could negatively impact upon my ability to access/exit my property. Also I seek an assurance that should I need support from the emergency services, they can readily get to me at all times.

The proposed development is approximately 75 yards from Humberston Avenue, building work, services installation and the removal of trees would totally disrupt access to my home and cause damage to the access road and services.

My property's sewerage connection to the public sewer runs down the centre of my drive/ access road. Other services run parallel to it on the eastern side of the plot such as gas, water, electric and phone. I am concerned that there might be a disruption to these services having a hugely detrimental impact upon my ability to be able to continue to reside in my property and to my general safety and wellbeing.

The sewerage pipe work is close to the surface and there is a manhole, neither is designed to withstand heavy or unduly regular traffic going across it at that point.

The southern aspect of my home is where my lounge is situated. Looking towards the proposed dwelling would dominate my view and be overbearing.

On safety grounds I am concerned that the design does not have an adequate turning area. The access road is narrow and I seek confirmation that the passing place is of a suitable width to allow two cars to pass.

My concerns include access, security and continuity as it is my residence and has been for almost 50 years.

Yours sincerely

RON HORNER

28th Oct. 2019.

Regarding application: Objection for DM/0887/19/FUL 41 Humberston Avenue, Humberston
(amended plans)

I have looked at the revised plans and I am still of the opinion that the proposed dwelling to the garden land of 41 is an over-intensification that it is unsuitable for the size of plot, given it is to back land to the front property. Also, it concerns me as it a 1.5 storey property that is being suggested and I live in a bungalow. Furthermore, the access issues are a huge worry for me. I cannot see where vehicles will turn on it when residents park to the front of the garages. I fear I will be obstructed from leaving and re-entering my property. When this new build is sold off, who really can tell what the new people will in reality be like. Should they choose to be inconsiderate and overpark the turning area (which appears to be partly in the access road) how will I manage to gain entry to my property? The access road will not be adopted and therefore technically unenforceable. A previous owner to 41 tried to gain permission to build on this site. It was turned down for three reasons, as it was deemed being developed into three plots was inappropriate, on access issues and regarded as an over-intensification of the site. I objected to this at the time and in fact still have a copy of the paperwork on file. I still feel the same now. I remember this application went all the way to appeal and was in fact dismissed given the issues. Ironically if anything the access is worse now than it was then, due to an extension the property sits over the building line of the access road and such the access is less than it was at the point of the dismissed appeal.

My home underwent a Safe and Well visit this week from the Fire Service, they confirmed that the access road is too narrow for a Fire Service engine to be able to get down. This will apply to the proposed new infill property too of course if given permission to be built. Although the Fire Service operate smaller trucks (Tactical Division) these do not have the capacity to fight a house fire, only a full size Fire Engine has this capacity. The Humberside Fire Service has confirmed this and unfortunately, they will not be able to get through on the narrow access road.

The applicant has suggested placing an electric gate to the front of the design. I am not sure how this will work and what the arrangements will be for me. The applicant has not spoken to me directly so I am in the dark how this will work in practice. This creates concern for me.

The rear garden land to 41 has been flooded for months. I have written to Mr. Limmer the case officer to report this. If 43 and 41 both get permission to build I am genuinely concerned where all the surface water will go and strongly suspect my property and gardens will suffer the consequences.

As you are aware I have lived in my home for a very long time and feel incredibly overwhelmed by the proposed development that the applicants around me are attempting to achieve. As you can imagine this situation feels very overbearing for me and is causing me a great deal of upset and concern. When I originally purchased my one storey bungalow, a substantial reason for doing so, was the charm of the area and how it felt spatially. I am not against sensitive building to "back land" but feel this application is an over-development of the plot. The fragmentation makes it detrimentally different to those around it and therefore diminishes the amenity both to the host house and to those around it. The proposed plan is therefore not in-keeping to this part of the Avenue and I whole heartedly object to it.

Yours sincerely,


RON HORNER

41A Humberston Avenue, Humberston

Dated 13th February 2020

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Dr Thomas Culshaw

Address: 43 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I totally agree with my neighbors of 39 and 41a Humberston Avenue of any development in the rear garden of no 41 Humberston Avenue it is such a confined area the upset and turmoil to the surroundings will be unbearable especially to the resident in no 41a there is no need for a squashed in house to be built it will look ridiculous and seriously spoil a reasonable quiet place to live also the loss of any trees is just not right we should be protecting our green nature

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage (Amended plans February 2020)

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sally Carroll

Address: 1a Abbotts Grange Humberston Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Dated 15th February 2020

I write to object to the revised plans submitted in relation to DM/0887/19/FUL - 41 Humberston Avenue, Humberston.

I am concerned about the level of building under consideration in close proximity to my dwelling. Not only has 41 submitted plans but also 43. Given these proposals are to back land I am genuinely concerned about how this level of fragmentation, if approved, has the potential to change the character to this part of the Avenue. I would prefer to see the large detached host properties to Humberston Avenue maintain an appropriate level of amenity and believe the plans number 41 has submitted diminishes the host property substantially and to its detriment. In my opinion this proposal constitutes both an overdevelopment and an over-intensification.

I live in a one storey property and I am concerned that applicants appear to be trying to build 1.5 storey properties to back land, as is the case with this particular proposal, and would suggest one storey properties would be more suitable (if they have to be constructed at all). I did not buy my one storey property believing other people would be able to obtain the go ahead to build around me with properties greater in storey height than my own. This is of great concern to me. The plans number 41 has submitted appear to have windows that will overlook my property and result in a diminished level of privacy for my own dwelling. The property to the rear (41A) is also a one storey property as well as the one next to it (39A). Allowing something greater in height within this particular back land locality would therefore, design wise, seem to be at odds and appear dominating.

In terms of the Avenue and its back land areas with a view to safeguarding its charm; I feel the loss of numerous large and mature trees from this site will also have a detrimental impact.

From looking at the plans I would like to point out that the access is very limited and would be too

narrow for a Fire Engine to pass through. I would never consider buying a property where it was not possible for the Fire Brigade to be able to gain access and believe many other home owners would feel the same. I cannot see how the plan submitted constitutes good, sustainable design. I sincerely hope the decision-makers involved with this proposal take my views on board in a considered manner and understand the reasons why I am objecting to it.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0887/19/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0887/19/FUL

Address: 41 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SW

Proposal: Erect a detached dormer bungalow with integral garage (Amended plans February 2020)

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Peter Doswell

Address: Hedgehog Hollow 1B Abbotts Grange HUMBERSTON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the style of a dormer bungalow. The proposed build is surrounded by 5 one storey properties and their privacy should and must be considered and protected.

12th February 2020

For the attention of Mr Richard Limmer, Engie

Mrs S Grundy, 2 Abbots Grange, Humberston

DM/0887/19/FUL

Dear Sir,

I would like to write to you in order to object to the plans (including the amended plan) for this planning application/proposal.

I have viewed the plans and it is my opinion that a four bedded property situated to the rear garden of number 41 is an unsuitable prospect and tends to diminish from the amenity of the host property. I do not believe this type of proposal is necessary given the large number of properties already being built within the area to the larger developments.

I struggle to see where the parking will be to this design as it is not clearly marked on the plans and I do not see where an adequate turning area has been provided. I fear this will ultimately cause disruption and problems for the neighbour to the rear given the narrow access road.

I previously lived at both 39 and also 39A Humberston Avenue. From my own observations I remember the ground tends to flood in this area and would seek assurance for the existing the residents in close proximity, if this is given the go ahead there is no raising of the ground level to this development.

I fear proposals, such as this, design wise are very much to the detriment of surrounding properties and, sadly if permitted, will tend to diminish the character to this part of the Avenue. My previous property at 39 is very much in symmetry with the proportions of 41 and also the properties directly opposite to 41 on the other side of the Avenue tend to be large detached dwellings sitting within substantial garden plots. Therefore this proposal is very much out of kilter with its immediate surroundings.

Mrs Susan Grundy

2 Abbots Grange

Humberston

Dated 12th February 2020

5 Abbotts Grange

Humberston

For the attention of the Case Officer, Engie

DM/0887/19/FUL – Re the amended plans February 2020

I am writing to you to raise an objection regarding this proposal. I am saddened by the level of building to garden land in Humberston Avenue in general but particularly to this one as it appears very shoehorned and crammed in. I live in a bungalow and believe proper consideration should be given to only allowing carefully thought out proposals to garden land, this is a four bedded, 1.5 storey property and is not appropriate.

I am aware another resident lives in a bungalow (being 41A) to the rear. I am concerned about the lack of turning area this design has. I feel it will cause problems for this resident, as he has only one means of accessing and exiting his property. I am of the opinion he could easily suffer obstruction if this is allowed to be constructed as per the current design. It will be extremely difficult for over parking issues to be managed as the access road will have an unadopted status and enforcement will prove problematic.

5 Abbotts Grange

Humberston

Carol Pedersen (Engie)

From: Barnoldby le Beck Parish Council <BarnoldbyPC@outlook.com>
Sent: 01 September 2021 13:49
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Cc: Richard Limmer (Engie)
Subject: DM/0077/21/FUL - Land Off Main Road

Planning Application: DM/0077/21/FUL. **Location:** Land Off Main Road, Barnoldby le Beck.

Proposal: Retrospective application for engineering operations to relocate soils. States nothing about treatment.

I can confirm that the above application was discussed by Barnoldby le Beck Parish Council at their meeting held on Tuesday 31st August 2021. Following a review of the plans and discussion, the Parish Council unanimously agreed that previous comments have not been addressed. The Parish Council maintain their previous stance to oppose this application. They have no further comments to add to those previously sent.

Kindest Regards

Kim

Kim Kirkham
Barnoldby le Beck Parish Clerk

BARNOLDBY-LE-BECK PARISH COUNCIL

Mrs K Kirkham
Clerk to the Council
Telephone: 07926 885 184
Email: BarnoldbyPC@outlook.com

14 Househams Lane
Legbourne
Louth
LN11 8LG

NELC planning Department
Case Officer - Richard Limmer

11th February 2021

Dear Sir,

Application Reference: - DM/0077/21/FUL, Land Off Main Road, Barnoldby le Beck.
Retrospective application for engineering operations to relocate soils.

Following a review of the above application and discussion, the Parish Council agreed to oppose this application on the following grounds: -

- 1) The Parish Council note that this is the third Ecology report in respect of the knotweed on this site, each drawing different conclusions as to the suitability of “dig and relocate” as a remedial plan. In addition, the guarantees within that plan apply to the building plots from which the waste was removed and not to the relocation area used. The plan refers to ongoing monitoring and treatment of the relocated waste however this is not being undertaken by the company who carried out the dig and relocate. The plan of action in respect of the treatment is unclear at present however it would be expected that this should be carried out by a competent organisation to ensure that it is effective and provides the necessary health, safety and environmental controls.
- 2) This site has already been reported to the environment agency who are concerned with how the removal/dumping of the contaminated soil has been completed.
- 3) NELC planning enforcement department has raised a enforcement notice (EN/0207/20) for breach of planning conditions relating to Japanese Knotweed and the Parish Council have previously requested that planning conditions should ensure that a control programme should be imposed and that it is carried out correctly and fully.
- 4) The relocated contaminated soil appears to be considerably higher than the specified limit and is much closer to a watercourse than the 7 metres advised within the code of practice or noted on the plans.
- 5) Ward Councillor David Hasthorpe has put forward a request that this application is heard before the planning committee due to serious issues raised concerning the disposal of this matter and unclear ongoing treatment plan.

In conclusion: - The Parish Council recommends that this application is not approved until a robust treatment plan is in place, a competent company oversees the controls and a certificate of warranty has been obtained.

Kindest Regards

Mrs Kim Kirkham
Barnoldby le Beck Parish Clerk

Comments for Planning Application DM/0077/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0077/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Main Road Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Retrospective application for engineering operations to relocate soils|cr|

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Mark Chapman

Address: 3 Beck Farm Mews Barnoldby le Beck

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The attached planning statement references that there will be treatment and monitoring of the material every two years, however it has not stated whether there has already been any treatment and if an approved company will be inspecting and treating the area.

This is retrospective planning. It would have been good if this could have been covered in the initial planning application.

As per previous concerns raised regarding communication and updates from the planning team, this is still a cause for concern this work was carried out nearly a year ago.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0077/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0077/21/FUL

Address: Land Off Main Road Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Retrospective application for engineering operations to relocate soils|cr|

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Customer Details

Name: Mr Joseph Nuttall

Address: 4 Beck Farm Mews Barnoldby Le Beck Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:I object to the retrospective planning of the removal of an extremely large amount of knotweed from a nearby development site which was then dumped at the end of our garden against the approved planning method of screening and removal (several knotweed reports including this one concluded that relocation was not a viable option). The notifiable waste has been moved off the development site against the approved planning as it was a cheaper way to get rid of it to prepare the site for saleable building plots rather than following the method set out in the planning (we were informed of this by workers on the site removing the knotweed). We were informed by the knotweed workers that they had never relocated such a large amount and had only relocated above ground to a dept of 15-25cm before, the height of this is over 1 metre over an extremely large area of which many trees have have had to be felled to make room for it. The knotweed had spread and got to a much more serious situation from their initial report due to an un-effective and non-professional spraying treatment (not performed by a specialist company) and the knotweed workers told us the same would happen after this relocation if a professional treatment plan was not enforced. Spraying in the relocation area concerns us as it will be so close to our garden and that of others where our children play and also a water way. This brings me to the point of the plans submitted by Ross Davey which are wildly inaccurate and have been confirmed as such by a site visit by the case officer. As already noted the height of the dumped knotweed is way over a metre (also seen by the case officer) but is marked as only half a metre on these plans. The distance of the very right of the knotweed against the boundary of the site is marked as 24.5 metres when it is actually approximately 7 metres (again as seen by the case officer) - also importantly this boundary which it is wrongly marked as 24.5 metres from is a free flowing water way which is not even marked on the plans which should be an important point to note when considering if the area to relocate to is suitable when considering a treatment plan needed to control it going forward. The site location plan outlined in red is also wrong and seen as such by the case officer. My concerns also extend to the fact that the local environment

department have said they have 'no comment' on this planning application - is this due to them seeing no water way on the submitted plans? - even so the national environment agency had concerns that a notifiable waste had been moved without permission and that the local environmental department should visit the site back in the summer last year but despite numerous telephone messages and emails sent by us no one has ever responded to us from the local council environmental department - something that we and the national agency find shocking and then to see them simply say 'no comment' just tops it off. The plans currently showing as I make this comment on the last day for comments to be submitted (21/2/21) are still those that are wrong so I don't see how any of the comment etc already made on the planning by such council departments can be taken into account when they are made on inaccurate information. To summarise it would be a travesty for planning to retrospectively approve an action which was made against previously approved planning as a way to cut costs for the developer. We are now faced with a huge amount of notifiable waste dumped in our village in an unauthorised and unsuitable area with many dog walkers and families walking and cyclists seen from our garden daily going through the area potentially spreading it all over the village. The knotweed company told me to get rid of the trainers I was wearing when I walked to the area as it can spread on your shoes. We initially made no comment on the planning of the plots as the development site is not near to our land and would not impact us but by taking this knotweed off the development site and dumping it at the end of our garden it has greatly effected us. The system should not be that people can go against approved planning and simply get retrospective planning for the aspects they didn't like as then what is the point in having a planning system to start with?

Comments for Planning Application DM/0449/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0449/21/FUL

Address: 142 Chichester Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire DN35 0JJ

Proposal: Erect first floor rear extension to create additional accommodation (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED DATED 2/08/2021 showing additional information for 45 degree tests).

Case Officer: Owen Toop

Customer Details

Name: Mr Kevin Holberry

Address: 140 Chichester Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The updated plans show no amendments to try and alleviate any of the constructive comments in my original objection e mail sent in May other than showing 45 degree lines. Please refer to that e mail when next reviewing the planning application.

Even though 45 degree lines are marked on the plan there are no dimensions (and no reduction in extension size) and as far as I am aware I have had no request from anyone to accurately measure from my property. I have measured, and the extension would have to be reduced by 1 metre in depth.

If granted with this 1 metre reduction No 142 would still have a brick wall of 3.91 metres protruding out only 2m from my habitable bedroom window (the rear wall of House No 142 already sits 1 metre proud of the wall at No 140).

Regards

Kevin Holberry

Planning - IGE (ENGIE)

From: Kevin Holberry
Sent: 20 May 2021 21:25
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: Planning application DM/0449/21/FUL 142 Chichester Road

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am the owner/occupier and neighbour (140 Chichester Road) of the persons who have submitted the above mentioned planning application. I am going against the application based on the constructive reasons below. It would be appreciated if you could consider them when reviewing the plans.

1) The submitted drawings do not give the full external dimensions of the proposed extension and they do not show how far the projected extension extends from the original building wall, this measurement is 3.91 metres, which is in excess of the allowable 3 metre second floor extension limit. The external width of the extension is approx 11 meters, the plan only shows the internal dimensions. The property already has a ground floor extension 43 metres square (is there not limits a house can be extended ?)

2) If building was allowed to go ahead as per plan and because the property already sits 1 metre proud to the rear of my property that means my nearest habitable room (bedroom at the rear) will have a view of a brick wall of 4.91 metres in length which is only 2.4 metres away.

3) The excessive size of this new build will overshadow the whole of the rear elevation of my property and deprive it of the light we have been used to for the 25 years we have been living here. Which is in excess of the "uninterrupted 20 years" stated in the right to light legislation . Also, as my property is North facing at the rear that will encourage further moss and lichen growth etc on the rear of my property. It is bad enough maintaining it now without reducing sunlight and light further.

4) Utilising the 45 degree rule from the centre of the nearest habitable 2nd floor bedroom means that the proposed extension would have to be reduced in size significantly so as not to cross the line. They are not helped by the fact their property already sits 1 metre proud on my property at the rear.

5) The physical size of the proposed 2nd floor extension is not in character or in keeping with the neighbours buildings. Most neighbours have extensions but after discussions with each other have decided to keep the extension on a ground floor level so as not to spoil the rear elevations and not to have over bearing builds spoiling /taking over the rear building line. From my rear garden the size of the build will just take over everything.

Regards
 Kevin Holberry
 140 Chichester Road.

From: Michael Brightmore

Sent: 10 August 2021 18:04

To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>

Cc: 'k.holberry'

Subject: Planning Application Reference: DM/0449/21/FUL for the attention of Owen Toop

Dear Planning Officer,

Thank you for your letter dated 2nd August 2021 (received 8th August) showing the additional information based on 45-degree tests. We still oppose this planning application and my further comments are contained in the attached 'Microsoft Word' document. I have also taken the liberty of attaching three photographs which I believe illustrate my comments more graphically.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this information.

Kind regards

Michael Brightmore

144 Chichester Road

Cleethorpes

DN35 0JJ





Application Summary

Reference **DM/0449/21/FUL**

Address: 142 Chichester Road Cleethorpes North East
Lincolnshire DN35 0JJ

Proposal: Erect first floor rear extension to create
additional accommodation

Case Officer: Owen Toop

Dear Planning Officer,

Thank you for your letter dated 2nd August 2021 (received 8th August) showing the additional information for 45-degree tests. This information in no way affects my strong objections to this application.

In addition to my previous comments, my response to this additional information is based on;

- (a) Building Research Establishment (BRE) document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice', and
- (b) The civil easement protecting an occupier's Right to Light, particularly where such a right has been enjoyed for a period exceeding 20 years.

The 45-degree tests submitted by the applicant are not relevant to my property (144) as there are no affected ground floor windows which are perpendicular to the proposed extension. In fact the 45-degree line intersects the building at a wooden gate to the undercover porch.

The acute deprivation of daylight and sunlight to my property together with the violation of our Right of Light, enjoyed for the past 33 years, mainly affects our kitchen window which is directly opposite the development. The fact that the proposed extension would deny us all direct daylight and sunlight through this aperture can readily be shown using the BRE's 25-degree test and is more graphically represented in the attached Photograph 'A' (taken through the kitchen window from just inside) and Photograph 'B' taken from just outside the kitchen window. The flat roof of the existing ground floor extension at 142 can be clearly seen. The proposed extension would of course tower above this, so depriving the window of all direct light.

The rear door and porch are adjacent to this window so this over-bearing structure would be in our faces every time we arrive and leave home.

To a somewhat lesser extent the proposed extension would also over-shadow our conservatory and not only reduce natural daylight but also obscure the morning breakfast sunlight for much of the year. This would easily fail the BRE's 25-degree elevation test. This deprivation of light can also be shown graphically from Photograph 'C' (taken from just inside the conservatory). Again, this over-bearing structure would be constantly visible from within the conservatory, especially from the dining table and settee.

Michael Brightmore
144 Chichester Road
Cleethorpes
DN35 0JJ

10th August 2021

Comments for Planning Application DM/0449/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0449/21/FUL

Address: 142 Chichester Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire DN35 0JJ

Proposal: Erect first floor rear extension to create additional accommodation

Case Officer: Owen Toop

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Brightmore

Address: 144 Chichester Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Previous planning applications (DC/540/04/HAV and DC/934/04/HAV) for a similar, though smaller, extension to this property were submitted in 2004. Both were refused on the grounds that:-

(1) The proposed extension would, by reason of its size and disposition on the site, have a detrimental impact on such residential amenities as the occupier(s) of the adjoining dwellings might reasonably be expected to enjoy. This would be contrary to policies GEN1 and H11 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2003.

(2) The proposed extension, if built, would detrimentally affect the outlook from 144 Chichester Road by reason of its size and massing and therefore fails to satisfy the policies GEN1 and H11 of the Local Plan 2003.

The second refusal decision was determined at a Planning Committee meeting on 22 October 2004 following a site visit.

A third planning application for an even smaller extension (DC/110/05/HAV was submitted on 03 February 2005 and subsequently approved with conditions on 14 April 2005. The first floor extension proposed in this application was only one third of the width of this most recent planning application, but was never built, though the ground floor extension to the kitchen has been constructed.

I have referred to these previous planning application decisions due to the fact that the reasons for the previous refusals still apply to this new application, in fact more so due to the increased size of the extension.

This extension would over-shadow our property and significantly reduce the natural light to our

ground floor east facing windows, particularly in the kitchen (which already suffers from limited daylight). In fact the only direct sunlight received by these windows would be blocked by the proposed extension.

Since the previous planning applications we have constructed a north facing conservatory at the rear of the premises which relies on its east facing aspect for the morning Sun and would therefore be detrimentally affected by the proposed extension.

The sheer size of the extension would, from our perspective, be overpowering and claustrophobic, especially as we have lived at this address for 33 years without overlooking such a structure.

As a tall conifer dividing hedge between 144 and 142 has recently been removed and replaced by a much lower wooden fence, this extension would also be visible from all parts of our garden.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0449/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0449/21/FUL

Address: 142 Chichester Road Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire DN35 0JJ

Proposal: Erect first floor rear extension to create additional accommodation (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED DATED 2/08/2021 showing additional information for 45 degree tests).

Case Officer: Owen Toop

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Ann Taylor

Address: 146 Chichester Road Chichester Road Cleethorpes

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The proposed extension is out of character with other properties on Chichester Road and as such is very inappropriate

It would be hugely visible from my house.

It would overlook my property and be invasive of the privacy of my back garden

It is out of keeping with the ages and style of houses nearby

Comments for Planning Application DM/0168/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0168/21/FUL

Address: 55 Abbey Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0HN

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension to rear building to form additional funeral home services and associated external plant and new detached multi vehicle garage rear of site and single bay external car wash along with associated parking and landscaping (amended plans and description)

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Ms Lara Stradling

Address: 5 Manor Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: There will no doubt be an increase in vehicles using the site which our homes back onto and as a result more noise.

I'm also concerned that a car wash will mean a rise in noise levels.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0168/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0168/21/FUL

Address: 55 Abbey Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0HN

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension to rear building to form additional funeral home services and associated external plant and new single bay external car wash

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Ms Lara Stradling

Address: 5 Manor Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I live adjacent to the funeral home and am concerned a new extension will impact on our day to day lives. Not only will it mean more noise but it shouldn't be allowed in a conservation area. The proposed new extension will be closer to our boundaries and I'm concerned that will directly affect our privacy and noise levels will no doubt increase. I therefore object to this planning application.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0168/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0168/21/FUL

Address: 55 Abbey Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0HN

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension to rear building to form additional funeral home services and associated external plant and new detached multi vehicle garage rear of site and single bay external car wash along with associated parking and landscaping.

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mr Matthew Paton

Address: 13 Manor Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Any additions will presumably increase traffic throughout the property which already occurs at all

hours of the day. The addition of a car wash will also increase noise in the area. By decreasing the space which lorries, vans and cars pass through between building and boundary wall this poses a risk to my own property. This will have a negative impact on me and my property and that of my neighbours.

There was also no consultation with us as neighbours that back onto the Funeral Home yet we will see the changes most prominently out our own windows and when in our gardens.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0168/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0168/21/FUL

Address: 55 Abbey Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0HN

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension to rear building to form additional funeral home services and associated external plant and new detached multi vehicle garage rear of site and single bay external car wash along with associated parking and landscaping (amended plans and description)

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Ms F Hodson

Address: 13 Manor Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I own and live in a neighbouring property to this proposal. I firmly believe that this will impact on the quality of the outdoor space currently enjoyed. Not only blocking out sunlight, particularly in the evening but also creating an enclosed feel to the private side of our house. Have the applicants or agents provided any sunpath analysis?

By bringing the existing building 7445mm closer to the boundary wall this will clearly infringe on the outlook currently enjoyed by us and our neighbours.

There will be increased noise and air pollution from traffic through the site. This occurs throughout the day and night at present and we presume will increase if the extension is allowed. The addition of the pressure washing facilities will also create further noise pollution.

In addition to this, and contrary to the Heritage Assessment compiled, I believe the proposed extension will detract from the appeal of the building's front elevation. 55 Abbey Road is in a Conservation Area and the proposed mass of the extension, its location and blank elevational treatment are not sensitive to this. Although it is not locally nor nationally listed the building does contribute significantly towards the quality of the Conservation Area. Existing extensions do not affect the frontage of the building as they are located within the width of the original villa. Whereas this extension protrudes out from the original building line and will have a detrimental affect on the setting of the existing property and the surrounding Conservation Area.

We recommend that the application is refused.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0168/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0168/21/FUL

Address: 55 Abbey Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0HN

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension to rear building to form additional funeral home services and associated external plant and new single bay external car wash

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Ms F Hodson

Address: 13 Manor Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I own and live in a neighbouring property to this proposal. I firmly believe that this will impact on the quality of the outdoor space currently enjoyed. Not only blocking out sunlight, particularly in the evening but also creating an enclosed feel to the private side of our house. Have the applicants or agents provided any sunpath analysis?

By bringing the existing building 7445mm closer to the boundary wall this will clearly infringe on the outlook currently enjoyed by us and our neighbours.

There will be increased noise and air pollution from traffic through the site. This occurs throughout the day and night at present and we presume will increase if the extension is allowed. The addition of the pressure washing facilities will also create further noise pollution.

In addition to this, and contrary to the Heritage Assessment compiled, I believe the proposed extension will detract from the appeal of the building's front elevation. 55 Abbey Road is in a Conservation Area and the proposed mass of the extension, its location and blank elevational treatment are not sensitive to this. Although it is not locally nor nationally listed the building does contribute significantly towards the quality of the Conservation Area. Existing extensions do not affect the frontage of the building as they are located within the width of the original villa. Whereas this extension protrudes out from the original building line and will have a detrimental affect on the setting of the existing property and the surrounding Conservation Area.

We recommend that the application is refused.

17 Manor Avenue
Grimsby
DN32 0QR



3rd September 2001

REF: Planning Application – 55 Abbey Road- DM/0168/21/FUL .
Contact Johnathan Cadd.

I do not agree with the amended planning application. This is already an over developed commercial business in a conservation area, close to houses in Manor Avenue and Abby Road with only a a three foot passage between the Co-op business and the back of the houses to Manor Avenue.

The business had change of business use in the late 1990's. The business has grown year on year, from being a small, quiet concern when first given planning permission.

The existing single floor extension took up most of the green open space, formly allotments prior to being a chest clinic.

Living in a conservation areas should not be under thereat by a commercial business , making the site and business more of am industrial site than a Conservation area.

The amended plan to place the garage with car wash will take away one of the present car parking areas, so where will the these vehicles go? The newly planned parking lots will not be give sufficient car parking space for staff and visitors, let alone the commercial vehicles.

The volume of cars and heavier type vehicles such as the deliver lorry with the coffins and the horse and cart heavy transport already struggles at peak times and the horse and car vehicle left on site for long periods of times, this effects more of the houses numbers 11 -23 two of these properties have been recently sold and the occupants probably are not aware to the full extend or even the panning application.

I understand that the co-op has gone into partnership with another local funreal company, this can only make the situation worse.

Yours,

A. A. MILLAR.
17 MANOR AVE.

From: Christina McGilligan-Fell
Sent: 07 April 2021 12:11
To: Jonathan Cadd <Jonathan.Cadd@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Re Pictures

Dear Jonathan

These images are by no means reflection of a busy period, merely quieter periods.

Wednesday 7th April am.

Delivery of Coffins revealing close proximity to my rear garden. The Horse box and carriage when it arrives is parked up (for the duration of the funeral) adjacent to the alley wall which can be for long periods of a time
The first image of the private car washing was taken on Saturday and not Thursday as previously stated. My apologies for this error.

I hope these images are of some use.

Kindest regards,

Christina

21 Manor Avenue



Comments for Planning Application DM/0168/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0168/21/FUL

Address: 55 Abbey Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0HN

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension to rear building to form additional funeral home services and associated external plant and new single bay external car wash

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Ms Christina McGilligan-Fell

Address: 21 Manor Ave Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: In a Conservation area with a period style property that was a former Chest Clinic prior to becoming change of use for present business that has over expanded in recent years; more so in the present climate of Covid 19 which I feel are pushing the boundaries of being in a residential area with close proximity to houses and gardens.

I was somewhat concerned yesterday, Sunday 21st March there was private car washing at the rear of the property, which was neither business nor expectable with the level of use and noise sounding into my home at 21 MANOR AVE without the windows or doors being opened. In a working week, I find of an equal disturbance in noise levels, which I have complained to the management of the Co-op with no satisfaction. Although I am not opposing the newly constructed car wash in principle, I would request that no car washing was to take place on Sundays unless absolutely essential.

With regards to the side extension - again. I hold reservations for the close proximity to the adjacent properties with the expansion of the business in a conservation area with deliveries of coffins, type and nature of business with increase of traffic and parking by visitors that will have an impact from my property with vehicles coming and going. This is an expanding commercial business that is unusual in such a prime residential and Conservation area that has been acceptable on a previous level of activity/ business; however, I feel strongly that this application should not be approved taking into account the location, the increase in business and deliveries with the volume of further vehicles from visitors and clients alike which I find is a disturbance of peace for local residents.

Over the years, cars do come and go during the night, that have disturbed my children's sleep,

although my children are now grown up and left the family home, I still find that visitors, (pre cover) did make frequent complaints of being disturbed by cars puling up at the back of the business during all hours of the night.

-----Original Message-----

From: Christina McGilligan-Fell

Sent: 07 April 2021 11:36

To: Jonathan Cadd <Jonathan.Cadd@nelincs.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Planing application DM/0168/21/Ful

Dear Jonathan,

Further to my objection with the above application, I wish to submit photographic evidence with pictures to follow taken over a quiet Easter holiday period to support my objections.

The images clearly demonstrate how busy the business is without further expansion in what is a Conservation and residential area.

I trust the photographs will be taken into account with the final decision.

Thank you in anticipation.

Christina McGilligan-Fell

21 Manor Avenue



Coffin deliveries - proximity of activity to neighbours





Photo received 7th April 2021

3rd April 2021



Good Friday 2nd April 2021





6th April 2021



Wednesday 7th April 2021



Monday 12th April 2021



From: Christina McGilligan-Fell
Sent: 06 September 2021 12:51
To: Jonathan Cadd <Jonathan.Cadd@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: 55 Abbey Road

Afternoon Jonathan,

I hope you're well.

Further to my voice mail that I left on your answering machine, please see the photographs in support to my objection for the amended planning application to the above address.

The vehicles clearly demonstrate that the site is just not big enough to cater for a commercial expansion that this business has already become without further development.

I have also submitting on line my reasons to the objection.

The resident from Number 17 Manor Ave is to have his objections dropped off at the Engie Office today by hand.

Kindest regards,

Christina

21 Manor Avenue







Comments for Planning Application DM/0168/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0168/21/FUL

Address: 55 Abbey Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0HN

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension to rear building to form additional funeral home services and associated external plant and new single bay external car wash

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mr M Paton

Address: Manor Avenue Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This design is not in keeping with the local conservation area.

Any additions will presumably increase traffic throughout the property which already occurs at all hours of the day. The addition of a car wash will also increase noise in the area. By decreasing the space which lorries, vans and cars pass through between building and boundary wall this poses a risk to my own property. This will have a negative impact on me and my property and that of my neighbours.

There was also no consultation with us as neighbours that back onto the Funeral Home yet we will see the changes most prominently out our own windows and when in our gardens.

Angela Tynan (Engie)

From: Andy Hopkins
Sent: 27 April 2021 14:50
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: Planning Application Reference: DM/0422/21/FUL

Hi Jonathan

I'm sure you will be getting a formal objection on this from the Town Council in due course but a few points and queries please:

Residents have already raised this issue with our Councillors as they do not believe what is happening is right.

If this is public land who owns it, has a land reg search been done?

Are there any covenants on this public land?

We don't feel that public spaces should be taken by individuals when it has been maintained for the public by Immingham Town Council. This would benefit one individual at the detriment of the other residents.

The statement that the occupier has maintained this for 20 years is not true, the Town Council have been mowing it as long as staff can remember.

In section 25 – are they declaring they are the owner?

25. Ownership Certificates and Agricultural Land Declaration CERTIFICATE OF OWNERSHIP - CERTIFICATE A - Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 Certificate under Article 14 I certify/The applicant certifies that on the day 21 days before the date of this application nobody except myself/the applicant was the owner* of any part of the land or building to which the application relates, and that none of the land to which the application relates is, or is part of, an agricultural holding** * 'owner' is a person with a freehold interest or leasehold interest with at least 7 years left to run. ** 'agricultural holding' has the meaning given by reference to the definition of 'agricultural tenant' in section 65(8) of the Act. NOTE: You should sign Certificate B, C or D, as appropriate, if you are the sole owner of the land or building to which the application relates but the land is, or is part of, an agricultural holding. Person role The applicant The agent Title Mr First name Stuart Surname Naylor Declaration date (DD/MM/YYYY) 21/04/20

I would appreciate any feedback on this please so we can formulate our response.

Kind regards

Andy

Andy Hopkins
Town Clerk
Immingham Town Council

Civic Centre, Pelham Road

Immingham DN40 1QF

Please be aware that I am not in the office all the time. I will respond when I can. If urgent please call 01469 727272 who may be able to help.

This message and any attachments are confidential and should only be read by those to whom they are addressed. Access to this message by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, or distribution of the message, or any action or omission taken by you in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. As a public body, Immingham Town Council may be required to disclose this email or any response to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, unless the information in it is covered by one of the exemptions in the Act. Please immediately contact the sender if you have received this message in error. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact us immediately, delete the message from your computer and destroy any copies.

Internet communications are not always secure and therefore Immingham Town Council does not accept legal responsibility for this message. The recipient is responsible for verifying its authenticity before acting on the contents. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Immingham Town Council.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0422/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0422/21/FUL

Address: 8 Fairisle Rise Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RQ

Proposal: Retrospective application for the change of use of adjacent public land to form part of domestic curtilage (amended ownership certificates)

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mr Immingham Town Council Town Clerk

Address: Civic Centre Immingham

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Parish Council

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The Council objects to this application on the following grounds:

The Council believe this application has an adverse effect on open space amenity for residents as it involves the loss of publicly maintained land.

It would also change the character of the area by taking away public land that is to the benefit of all to enjoy.

The Council draws to your attention to how this goes against North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 to 2032 and the National Planning Policy Framework, as we believe the land is not surplus to requirement and has been maintained as a public open space:

North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 to 2032

Policy 43

Green space and recreation

1. The Council will safeguard against any loss of public or private green spaces, sport and recreation and equipped play facilities in recognition of their importance to the health and well-being of residents and visitors to the Borough, and their importance to biodiversity.

2. Loss of these areas will only be accepted where:

A. there is evidence that the facility is surplus to green space and recreation requirements, and

has been assessed in terms of biodiversity value; or,

Justification

14.239 The safeguarding and provision of accessible green space is a key element in creating sustainable communities, and promoting healthy lifestyles. Good provision of recreation and open space can also have positive economic and environmental benefits. Policy 43'Green space and recreation recognises the value of both public and private facilities, and sets out criteria to guard against the loss of facilities where they are valued.

The National Planning Policy Framework states:

Open space and recreation

96. Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space

97. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

(a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements

It is thought that the original housing development in the area probably had an element of open space planned for as part of the original applications for the benefit of the residents in the vicinity.

Looking at the area it is clear that future development was possible at the end of Margaret Street and these open spaces would have been kept free for bringing the two sites together.

This might also explain the comment from the drainage team that pipes/drainage is under the piece of land and should not be developed:

The permeable grassed area must be retained.

There is a public foul sewer running under the land in question so there should be no tree planting or building over this sewer

We do not support the claim in the application from the applicant that:

Public grass verge maintained by our client and the previous owner for the past twenty years

Immingham Town Council have cut the open space, as public land, since around 2012 and was possibly done by North East Lincolnshire Council prior to this.

This is supported by the ITC mapping that has a grass cutting layer dated 2011 showing the area highlighted for us to cut. (Copy sent to Planning Officer)

Residents who have commented on the application have confirmed this:

"..that piece of land has always been maintained by Immingham Town Council. It is not right that people can just take over public green spaces just because it adjoins their property! Green spaces are there for everyone to enjoy and if we all did the same there would be no green spaces left."

"Green spaces are for the well being and benefit of everyone. This cynical take over has created a garden large enough to accommodate a substantial structure. The Planning Department is in place so that situations like this don't arise. Neighbours should not be forced to have to publically denounce one anothers actions. It creates completely unnecessary tension. The council have always maintained the green and it has never been left to householders to keep tidy"

"I don't agree with taking over public green space without prior consent. This piece of land was always neatly maintained by the council and has a matching green space opposite. We cant just go round "adopting" public areas, digging it up and planting trees, without prior consent. This piece of land DOUBLES the existing garden at the property concerned."

ITC also supports those resident's comments above that this IS publicly maintained open space for the residents to enjoy and should not be taken into private hands.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0422/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0422/21/FUL

Address: 8 Fairisle Rise Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RQ

Proposal: Retrospective application for the change of use of adjacent public land to form part of domestic curtilage (amended ownership certificates)

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Marion Bradley

Address: 6 Fair Isle Rise Immingham nr Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The owners of no 8 are using a digger to tear up the green space they have a retrospective planning application for. So far they have planted a hedge around it...put garden furniture on it...and are now churning it over so it looks like a ploughed field. Can this be acceptable?

Comments for Planning Application DM/0422/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0422/21/FUL

Address: 8 Fairisle Rise Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RQ

Proposal: Retrospective application for the change of use of adjacent public land to form part of domestic curtilage (amended ownership certificates)

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Marion Bradley

Address: 6 Fair Isle Rise Immingham nr Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Sadly i find this retrospective planning application very disrespectful. The piece of land in question had a hedge planted around it weeks ago and garden furniture placed on it. That required a belief that no one would either notice or care. Green spaces are for the well being and benefit of everyone. This cynical take over has created a garden large enough to accommodate a substantial structure. The Planning Department is in place so that situations like this don't arise. Neighbours should not be forced to have to publically denounce one anothers actions. It creates completely unnecessary tension. The council have always maintained the green and it has never been left to householders to keep tidy. We need our open spaces for our wildlife and our own emotional well being. To set a precedent that allows any adjacent home owner to annexe such areas..... simply because they abut their property...could eventually lead to all common land being claimed. There is no justification for the actions taken by no 8 Fair Isle Rise and i would ask the Planning Committee to please recognise this and find the application cannot be approved.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0422/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0422/21/FUL

Address: 8 Fairisle Rise Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RQ

Proposal: Retrospective application for the change of use of adjacent public land to form part of domestic curtilage (amended ownership certificates)

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Linda Sleeman

Address: 1 Arran Close Immingham

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Although we only live around 200 metres from the property concerned we had no letter advising of the application. I go on my daily walk past this house and when the property owners initially took their fence down and planted hedging, I did wonder if they had permission to do so, as in the 34 years of us living in Arran Close that piece of land has always been maintained by Immingham Town Council. It is not right that people can just take over public green spaces just because it adjoins their property! Green spaces are there for everyone to enjoy and if we all did the same there would be no green spaces left.

Two weeks ago a mini digger appeared and this has been used to considerably excavate the area concerned, removing the turf etc. Lots of bags of gravel and sand have been delivered in the last few days, and to my horror, when I was walking along the track at the back of Arran Close/Fairisle Rise on Saturday the property owner was in the process of using the digger to extend his plot at the rear as well, commandeering the grass verge all the way up to the track! This now means his plot juts out from everyone else's. If this application is pending how can this be allowed to happen?

We strongly request that this application is rejected.

Thank you.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0422/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0422/21/FUL

Address: 8 Fairisle Rise Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RQ

Proposal: Retrospective application for the change of use of adjacent public land to form part of domestic curtilage (amended ownership certificates)

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mrs WENDY FUTERS

Address: 4 Arran Close Immingham

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Despite our letters informing us of this retrospective application giving us until May 30th to lodge objections, the work on this green space continues. Over the past few days, a digger has been used to dig up the grass. If this is still under discussion, how can this be acceptable?

Comments for Planning Application DM/0422/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0422/21/FUL

Address: 8 Fairisle Rise Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RQ

Proposal: Retrospective application for the change of use of adjacent public land to form part of domestic curtilage

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mrs WENDY FUTERS

Address: 4 Arran Close Immingham

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I don't agree with taking over public green space without prior consent. This piece of land was always neatly maintained by the council and has a matching green space opposite. We can't just go round "adopting" public areas, digging it up and planting trees, without prior consent. This piece of land DOUBLES the existing garden at the property concerned.

Comments for Planning Application DM/0422/21/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DM/0422/21/FUL

Address: 8 Fairisle Rise Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 1RQ

Proposal: Retrospective application for the change of use of adjacent public land to form part of domestic curtilage (amended ownership certificates)

Case Officer: Jonathan Cadd

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Lynda Traves

Address: 115 Margaret Street Immingham Grimsby

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Yet again more green area taken away...they have cut trees on the edge of the field when they moved in....which have been there for many years...now this green area they have taken over....if they wanted a bigger garden...should have gone for a house with more land...I personally feel they have just done what they want and feel they don't have to ask but just take....plus it looks like a junk yard....

ASHBY CUM FENBY PARISH COUNCIL

C/O Kim Kirkham, Council Clerk
14 Househams Lane
Legbourne
Louth, LN11 8LG
Tel: 01507 608488
Email: ashbyparishclerk@gmail.com

By e-mail to:
planning@nelincs.gov.uk

Officer – Richard Limmer

12th July 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

DM/0609/21/FUL – Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) as granted on DM/1162/19/FUL for revision to omit green roof and install panels.

I can confirm that the above application was discussed by Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Council and that they recommended to oppose this application on the following grounds: -

1. Due to the sites rural location which extends into the open countryside the solar panels would have a significantly detrimental impact on the visual aesthetics of the area.
2. This development is adjacent to and within sight of the Lincolnshire Wolds, which has been designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
3. Concerns were raised regarding the impact and loss of habitat that solar panels may create.
4. The loss of habitat from solar panels do not help biodiversity and could prove a possible threat.

Yours sincerely,

Kim Kirkham
Ashby cum Fenby Parish Council Clerk
For and on behalf of Ashby Cum Fenby Parish Council