

Supplementary Planning Agenda - 23rd April 2025

Item 1

From: Hayley Bevan <
Sent: 11 April 2025 11:39
To: ONN, Melanie (MP) <
Cc: Owen Toop (EQUANS) <Owen.Toop@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Urgent. Planning application objection

Hayley Bevan
52 Glenfield road
Grimsby
DN37 9EF

11/04/2025

Dear Melanie Onn

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed planning permission for the development of land adjacent to Glenfield Road, Ashby close .

<https://planninganddevelopment.nelincs.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=SK0KGQLJGXX00&activeTab=summary>

The potential loss of the existing recreational playground and public path that have served our community and school pupils for many years. They state losing the path will not add time on the

pupils walking to school but it was add risks. Walking along the main road. As you can see we have fought this since September and now would ask for your support.

As you are aware, these spaces are not merely vacant lots; they play a critical role in our children's physical and social development. The ground has been a vital area for children to engage in outdoor activities, promoting physical health, fostering social skills, and offering a safe environment for play as houses over look this sage space. The loss of this space would significantly reduce the available recreational areas for families in our community, potentially leading to adverse effects on children's well-being.

Additionally, the public path that runs adjacent to the proposed development is essential for school pupils who rely on it to safely access their educational facilities. Removing or altering this path would not slightly increase the travel distance for these students but also compromise their safety, as they would be forced to navigate busier routes without the convenience and security of the existing pathway.

The growing trend of urban development often overlooks the importance of maintaining green spaces and safe pathways; however, it is crucial for the overall health of our community that we prioritize these integral resources. Preserving the playground and public path should be a fundamental consideration in the planning process, as it supports not only the physical health of children but also their emotional and social development. Why do we need 4 x 4 bed houses on that tiny bit of land with the proposal of the frsheny valley, new builds on Cambridge and houses already for sale on this street which haven't sold. Please inform where the need is for affordable housing. Theirs no need for this it's greed. The council selling the land for profit. The developers lining their pockets, no concern for residents views. We have been objecting since October but then they keep harassing us with adjustments, meaning we have to re-object again. This is not so simple for the elderly resident who doesn't have Internet access. Pete at the end house of Glenfield road which the development would be direct next to, he has terminal cancer. He told Mr Toop direct he wishes for his final months in his own home without building noise and pollution in the summer. No one cares about his or anyone else's health and wellbeing though.

I urge you to take our concerns into account and advocate for the preservation of the ground and public path in your discussions surrounding this development proposal. Our children deserve safe and accessible places to play and engage with their peers, and it is our duty as a community to ensure these resources are safeguarded for future generations. Why do the council not.make it a park. We know why, that's not financially beneficial to the council.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to your support in advocating for our community's children and the safeguarding of their recreational spaces. Please look at the link and the neighbours objections. The apparent community comments ends 14/4/25 but actually no one can longer add comments, conveniently.

I have copied Planning Owen Toop into thie.

Sincerely,

Hayley Bevan

From: Mark Bevan <
Sent: 11 April 2025 10:49
To: Planning - IGE (Equans) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Owen Toop- Glenfield road

You don't often get email from

I cannot add my comment I thought we had til the 14th as it states on the important dates so again comment disabled is ?another ploy to stop us having a objection. Please add my comment .

MARK BEVAN
52 Glenfield Road
Grimsby.

Once again WE stronlgy object , but in response to the developers tit for tat statement.

Reduced Parking Spaces for Existing Residents:

The provision of off-street parking for new homes does not automatically translate to a reduction in parking issues for existing residents. This development will likely increase the total number of vehicles in the area, potentially leading to parking congestion; existing residents may find it challenging to find on-street parking due to an influx of vehicles and the new double yellow lines you propose . . Which the highway guy said as only been propoaped to work positively in favour of your new builds. But hey it benefits your plans doesn't benefit anyone else.

Development Preventing Walk-Through:

The argument that the extra distance is acceptable does not take into account the inconvenience to pedestrians, especially families with children or those with mobility issues. The dangers it poses for school pupils from .not juat whitgift but wybers primary and Great Coates School. The loss of a direct walking route can discourage walking in general, increases reliance on vehicles, and further erodes the local community with parking issues

*** Wildlife:***

The proposal to plant new trees and maintain the hedgerow may be insufficient to offset the loss of existing habitats. Even with assurances for wildlife corridors like Hedgehog Highways, the removal of a tree can significantly disturb local ecosystems. Furthermore, the suggested measures may not be effective in mitigating the loss of biodiversity in the immediate area, especially in the short term.

Area Used as Play Area for Local Children:

The acknowledgment that the area was previously a disused car park does not negate its ongoing recreational use by local children as an informal play area. The

developers' stance that the land cannot be deemed safe does not take into account the community's adaptation to local circumstances, and removing this space may lead to a lack of safe play areas for children within walking distance from their homes. You state you have sympathy for this matter as parents yourself. Tell me where is the sympathy. Clearly your two boys have space to run round in your eco friendly environment. Our children don't have many safe spaces round here.

Disruption Due to Building Works:

While measures to mitigate disruption have been mentioned, construction projects often create unintended consequences, such as noise pollution, increased traffic disruption, and dust that can affect neighboring residents' quality of life. Residents may find the potential inconveniences outweigh the prospective benefits of new housing developments. After all as Mr Toop was told one neighbour has a terminal illness and doesn't want to spend the remainder of their time on their house with doors and windows shut throughout summer. They won't be able to sit in their own garden due to noise and pollution. But again greed is more important than need.

Houses Not in Keeping with the Street:

While the developers argue that the new homes will resemble existing semi-detached houses, the materials used (e.g., brick vs. cladding) can create a jarring aesthetic. The claim of empathy towards the street scene might be subjective. Show me what houses down this street have car porches. And the ones facing Ashby look nothing like the neighbours. Next joke Rameco?

Affordable housing

The need for affordable housing . Pardon. If the Freshney Valley goes ahead with 3000 homes there's no need for these semis squashed on a tiny bit of land.. we already have the new builds being built on Cromwell fields. Look around what makes these affordable. Nothing. It lines someone's pocket like we've all said . GREED NOT NEED.

Response to Accusations and Harassment:*

- While the developers' description of residents' comments as "frivolous and hurtful" could perhaps suggest maybe you're not fully engaging with the real and deeply felt concerns from the community. If residents feel alienated or dismissed, the developers risk creating further conflict while failing to address the legitimate fears and objections of those impacted by their plans. Not being listened to has caused this. How many times have we all objected. Some may say we're being harassed. As every time we object RamEco change their plans and we go through this objection malarkey again. You forget many elderly neighbours don't have access to online comment sections and have to write an objection. Not once have you been to speak with residents. Sent Owen Toop on your behalf. Who also misinformed us where the plans we were supposed to get. One big cover up by NEL and we all still believe brown envelopes exchanged.

In conclusion, while the development proposal responds to some concerns with plans and reassurances, it may not adequately address the broader social, environmental, and practical implications of the project, which should be carefully considered by planning authorities and the community alike. Time to listen to the

residents. Nothing personal Liz/Rob but plenty of land elsewhere to build on, so look elsewhere.

Supplementary - Item 2 DM/0108/24/FUL

- That the decision be delegated to the Assistant Director Regeneration following completion of a consultation period for the MOD on 4th May 2025 and subject to no objections being raised or prior to that confirmation from the MOD of no objections.
- Amend condition 1 to allow development to commence within five years. This in acknowledgement of the applicants request that a longer commencement period is required due to the need to obtain grid connections.

Item 7

From: Alan Nicholson
Sent: 17 April 2025 16:04
To: Planning - IGE (Equans) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application DM/0900/24/FUL

Good Afternoon,

The Civic Society would like to make further comment in relation to Planning Application DM/0900/24/FUL. Subsequent to our previous comment, a site visit was undertaken and the result of which is that we submit that the area planned for this development is not sufficient for the planned two dwellings. We oppose this application.

Kind Regards,

Alan Nicholson

GC&DCS Planning Group