

Carol Pedersen (EQUANS)

From: james
Sent: 07 June 2024 18:16
To: Planning - IGE (Equans)
Subject: Re DM/1019/23/REM

You don't often get email from [redacted]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning department

I have missed the deadline for submitting a comment on an application
(DM/1019/23/REM) that is due to go before the planning committee on June 12.

However, I might still be possible for an inclusion in any supplementary agenda.

My concern is that the Beal Homes proposal includes no provision for installation of any swiftbricks in a project of 500-plus homes.

Other housebuilders now routinely install swiftbricks - and there are no fewer than 105 in the Barratt Homes development in New Waltham.

If there is no overriding objection from the committee, please could I therefore request that a minimum of 10 swiftbricks are installed (preferably in reasonable proximity because the species is a colony-nester).

Such an initiative would be in line with NELC policy to give encouragement to nature and wildlife whenever opportunities arise.

(I should state that I have previously submitted this request to Beal Homes, but so far have received no reply.)

Many thanks

Best regards

Jim Wright

5 Beck Farm Mews Photos to accompany below Representation dated 10th May 2024.

ITEM 2













Megan Green (EQUANS)

From: Planning - IGE (Equans)
Subject: FW: DM/0362/24/FUL

10.05.2024

>

> Application Reference: DM/0362/24/FUL

> Address: 7 Beck Farm Mews Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshire DN37 0BH

> Proposal: Change of use from dwellinghouse (C3) to children's care home (C2)

> Case Officer: Owen Toop

> Mr Doug Clarke

> 5 Beck Farm Mews, Barnoldby le Beck, DN37 0BH Neighbour Objection

>

> I appreciate the need to provide care for disadvantaged and vulnerable children and acknowledge that number 7 has previously been used to provide foster care. However, I do not believe it appropriate, given the location, to change its use from that of a residential property to a commercial one, transforming it into a clinical environment with transient carers and a focus on profit to the detriment of the neighbourhood.

>

> Barnoldby le Beck is a Level 4 minor rural settlement that offers very few services and amenities, and poor accessibility to higher level settlements; as defined by Policy 3, of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. In summary it is an isolated village with no amenities other than the local public house, no recreational facilities, and no transportation links.

>

> There is no street lighting and few footpaths within Barnoldby le Beck. Access to Waltham, the neighbouring village, is over a mile away. To access it by foot is by way of an unlit, narrow, uncurbed footpath that starts at the boundary of the village and runs alongside a busy national speed limit road. The verge between road and path being as little as 0.5m in places and no more than a meter in others. Pedestrians are therefore at the mercy of the consideration of drivers using Church Lane, Chapel Lane, Old Main Road, and Waltham Road. As a pedestrian, I have personally had to take evasive action on several occasions to avoid being hit by a car. There are times of day that I refuse to walk this route. Anyone (staff and/ or residents) accessing the property other than by car would have to navigate this dangerous route.

>

> Beck Farm Mews is an unadopted, quiet, cul-de-sac of 9 residential properties, access to which is restricted by narrow (single file) access and severely restricted access and egress to Main Road, Barnoldby Le Beck. This is either via Church Lane, which was only intended to give access to the Grade 1 listed Church of Saint Helen and is barely wide enough for a car to pass due to vehicles that park on the lane at all times of the day or, via Chapel Lane which is marginally wider but insufficiently so for 2 cars to pass. Residents are regularly prevented from accessing Main Road by either or both Church and Chapel Lane by other road users blocking these narrow lanes. Attached is evidence of what residents are regularly faced with in terms of blocked access.

>

> The Block Plan states that there are "4 parking spaces available, 2 on the drive and 2 in a lay-by opposite" both of which it quotes as being 5 x 2.5m. This is confirmed in the Highways Comment where it states, "The property benefits from two existing off-street parking spaces". However, the dimensions of the average car in the UK is around 4.3m in length and 1.8mm in width with the average UK parking bay size being 2.4m wide by 4.8m long, information one would have expected Highways to have known given parking bay sizes are designed to suggested sizes which haven't changed since the 1970s. So, I question how 5 x 2.5m is sufficient to provide two existing off-street parking spaces? It is not unreasonable therefore to question what else regarding this application is inaccurate given this obvious inaccuracy?

>

> Furthermore, the Highways statement states "Any residual parking demand generated by the property could be accommodated within the two existing parking spaces within the layby opposite". It somewhat presumptive by the applicant and Highways to claim the use of the spaces in the layby for this application. These 2 spaces serve the residents of Beck Farm Mews, Church Lane, Chapel Lane, visitors to Church of Saint Helen, and users of the Wanderlust Way and are often occupied at all times of the day. Further capacity will result in vehicles illegally parking

on verges or blocking the narrow lanes. When considering planning application DM/0071/24FUL Highways state “Beck Farm Mews is adopted up to a point in front of 1 Beck Farm Mews. Within the adopted area there are two passing places to facilitate the passing of two vehicles”. Is this then a layby or is it a passing point? I’m confused and it appears that Highways are as well, or at the very least inconsistent. I therefore challenge the validity of the statement by Highways given this inconsistency and the previously highlighted inaccuracy regarding off road parking. Attached is evidence of what residents are regularly faced with in terms of parking.

>

> Local residents have been fortunate and I’m sure grateful that the foster children in the care of the residents at number 7 over the years have been courteous, well behaved, and not been disruptive which is a credit to the fostering families. It is pleasing to hear that many of these children have been attained achievements that many take for granted. However, moderate strength evidence shows that overall, residential care has no effect on children’s behaviour and skills, compared with non-residential placements. Given that many children will have suffered abuse and trauma, which can lead to challenging behavioural patterns it is therefore a concern that any problems arising from such patterns will not be sufficiently, if at all, addressed by Gravity Red Inspires. This will further impact local residents who will suffering the burden the additional levels of traffic, this commercial enterprise, will impose on this residential street.

>

> The statement of purpose states that residential children should have access to leisure pursuits and / or membership of local community clubs or groups yet these don’t exist in Barnoldby le Beck. There are no recreational amenities of any kind, the concern therefore is that, with the Church of Saint Helen only 2 doors away, the church yard will substitute for this. Local residents are working hard to raise funds to keep this church, parts of which date back to the 13th century, open. Any anti-social and/ or disruptive behaviour would likely result in its closure.

>

> As such I object to this proposal and suggest a more suitable location is found to provide these children the appropriate care suitable to their needs and safety.

>

> <supporting evidence.zip>

>

>

ITEM 4 - ASH HOLT, WAITHE LANE, BRIGSLEY



Waithe
Lane
Showing
Bridge and
Poor Road
Conditions



Waithe
Lane
Brigsley
Beck
Showing
Poor
Brickwork



Waithe
Lane
Bridge
Showing
Missing
Mortar
and Poor
Brick
Structure
Under
Bridge



Waithe
Beck
Bridge
Showing
Crack
Down
Centre
of Arch



Under Waithe Lane Bridge
Showing Poor
Miscellaneous
Use of Bricks
Many Cracks
and Missing
Mortar Poor
Condition



Under Waithe Lane Bridge Roof of Bridge and Side Wall Showing Missing Mortar Miscellaneous
Use of Bricks Very Poor Condition

THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL WEIGHTS & VOLUMES OF CONCRETE HAVE BEEN PREPARED BY A STRUCTURAL DESIGN ENGINEER & ARE FOR ESTIMATION PURPOSES ONLY.
CALCULATIONS ARE BASED ON A SIMILAR PORTAL FRAME STRUCTURE DESIGNED & ERECTED AT HORNCASTLE.

1) PAD FOUNDATIONS TO STEEL COLUMNS

Overall length of building = 61.0 metres (10 bays at 6.1 metres)
Portal Frame span = 22.5 metres column centres
Total no of Portal Frame columns = $2 \times 11 = 22$ no
Total no of Gable Frame columns = 6 no (3 per gable end)
Volume of concrete for each Portal Frame foundation = $2.0 \times 1.5 \times 0.5 = 2.4 \text{ m}^3$
Volume of concrete for 22 no pad foundations = $2.4 \times 22 = 52.8 \text{ m}^3$
Volume of concrete for 6 no Gable Posts = $1.0 \times 1.0 \times 0.4 \times 6 = 2.4 \text{ m}^3$
Total volume of concrete for Columns & Posts = $(52.8 + 2.4) = 55.2 \text{ m}^3$
Total weight of concrete for Columns & Posts = $23.6 \text{ Kn/m}^3 \times 55.2 = 1302.72 \text{ Kn}$
(130.7 TONS)

Quantity Calculations for Concrete for Portal Frame Structure

2) RAISED VIEWING AREA

Volume of concrete in floor slab = $11.5 \times 4.8 \times 0.15 = 8.28 \text{ m}^3$
Volume of concrete in boundary strip footing = $2 (11.4 + 4.8) \times 0.23 \times 0.15 = 1.12 \text{ m}^3$
Total volume of concrete in slab & strip footings = $8.28 + 1.12 = 9.4 \text{ m}^3$
Total weight of concrete in slab & strip footings = $23.6 \text{ Kn/m}^3 \times 9.4 = 22.2 \text{ Kn}$
(2.2 TONS)

Quantity Calculations for Concrete for Portal Frame Construction

3) STRIP FOOTINGS

Total length of peripheral strip footings to Portal Frame = $2 (62.45 + 22.71) = 170.32 \text{ metres}$
Length of peripheral strip footings between column & post bases = $(22 \times 1.5) + (6 \times 1.0)$
= 39.0 metres
Clear length of footings between bases = $170.32 - 39.0 = 131.32 \text{ metres}$
Volume of concrete for strip footings = $131.32 \times 0.6 \times 0.23 = 18.12 \text{ m}^3$
Weight of strip footings between bases = $23.6 \text{ Kn/m}^3 \times 18.12 = 427.7 \text{ Kn}$
(42.9 TONS)

SUMMARY OF READYMIX CONCRETE ASSOCIATED WITH PORTAL FRAME STRUCTURE

Total concrete weight from pad foundations to Steel Columns, Raised Viewing Area & Strip Footings
= $130.7 + 2.2 + 42.9 = 175.8 \text{ TONS}$
Total volume of concrete = $55.2 + 9.4 + 18.12 = 82.72 \text{ M}^3$



Waithe Beck Bridge Showing Missing Mortar Broken Bricks Vegetation Growing Very Old Bricks

Ruth Sutcliffe
Maple Grove
Waithe Lane
Brigsley

Carol Pedersen (EQUANS)

From: Owen Toop (EQUANS)
Sent: 04 June 2024 15:13
To: Carol Pedersen (EQUANS)
Cc: Martin Dixon (EQUANS); Cheryl Jarvis (EQUANS)
Subject: TO INSERT ON SUPPFW: 205 Humberston Fitties

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

From: Katie Teakle
Sent: Tuesday, June 4, 2024 11:56 AM
To: Owen Toop (EQUANS) <Owen.Toop@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: 205 Humberston Fitties

FAO NELincs Planning Committee

A belated observation that this is too high.

It sets a precedent for a predominant additional storey level.

Any alterations should be in keeping and sympathetic to the existing chalet, the sky-line and those dwellings that are immediately adjacent.

Thank you

Yours

Katie Teakle

85 Main Road DN36 4EU

Neighbour

Object

Sent from my iPad