

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING AGENDA - 8TH JANUARY 2025

ITEM 2 - DM/0803/24/FUL

From: John Bainbridge
Sent: 02 January 2025 13:30
To: Becca Soulsby (EQUANS) <becca.soulsby@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: 21 Signhills Avenue

Planning application consultation

Application reference: DM/0803/24/FUL

21, Signhills Avenue

Dear Ms Soulsby,

I note from your letter that we are invited to send comments about this development until 6th January. I assume such comments are to be sent to you, if not, I trust that you will let me know, or that you will pass them on.

This development is four doors away from me and does not impact on my property. However, I would like to make the following observations:

1. I do not believe that any unqualified person would be able to appreciate the size and appearance of the construction by looking at the plans that are published on your website. Even after greatly enlarging the plans on my computer screen I find it difficult to work out the dimensions. (I note that all measurements have been removed from the final plan.) It would seem reasonable that any neighbour directly affected should also receive a detailed verbal explanation in order to comprehend the scale of the project.
2. Does this set a precedent? Can anyone in the road now build an extension in the expectation that retrospective planning permission will be granted after the work has been completed?

Yours sincerely,
John Bainbridge
27, Signhills Avenue

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING AGENDA - 8TH JANUARY 2025

ITEM 6 - DM/0757/24/FULA

From: C Bradley

Sent: 06 January 2025 09:51

To: Becca Soulsby (EQUANS) <becca.soulsby@nelincs.gov.uk>; Planning - IGE (Equans) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>

Subject: DM/0757/24/FULA - Greenlands

Dear Ms Soulsby

I refer to the correspondence on file dated 02 December 2024 sent by Geoffrey Wagstaff, agent for the applicant. This email states that there "is no increase in height, the roof trusses will be laid on the existing wall plate".

It is our belief that this is categorically untrue. I attach photos of the original house and roof before the fire, where the height of the original roof and chimney can clearly be seen. This does NOT

correspond even remotely to the new height, which can be easily and immediately verified by a basic visual comparison.

Whilst the original roof was destroyed by the fire, the surrounding brick work and walls were undamaged and all remained. Despite this, we have watched (and photographed) the delivery and laying of numerous pallets of breeze blocks and bricks which have been hoisted up and laid to entirely alter the height of both the surrounding upper wall structures and the chimney. All of the new brickwork to the walls and chimney is clear to see. The chimney was undamaged by the fire and yet has been totally rebuilt to increase its height to reach over the top of the new height of the roof.

The view from our kitchen has been altered and significantly obscured due to the looming new extension, so quite how the agent can claim there has been "no increase" in height is utterly misleading to the committee.

Kind regards
Carrie Bradley
The Oakes
Old Main Road



Waltham Rd





