PHA replies added in red 20/10/2020

Although planning permission was applied for on 20/8/2020, work has been ongoing since February 2018 to clear the whole of the land surrounding No41 and the garage/workshop .

Many mature trees and shrubs have been removed and it already looks like a prepared building site. See Appendix 1 Photos 6 – 11. – No consent needed to remove trees from site.

I am opposed to this planning application, because of the following errors and omissions in the documents submitted and the designation of the land as Undevelopable and Unsuitable by the **South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (July 2018)**. Please see Appendix 3.

1 : The APPLICATION FORM WITHOUT PERSONAL DATA

8 :
This statement conflicts with proposal H21-0725-20. Should both applications succeed three separate dwellings will use the new access. – Both applications have been submitted separately and therefore have to reflect the proposal being put forward. The 2 apps cannot be cross referenced. So in the case of this app in isolation the number of units stated is correct.
10 :
There does not appear to be a full tree survey for this planning application. Many mature trees and shrub have been cleared. This has caused Bats, Woodpeckers and Owls to move from the proposed development site. See Appendix 1 Photos 7 to 11. – Site is not in conservation area and no trees are protected, there is/was no requirement for tree survey to be submitted as part of this application.
12 :
a) Land adjacent to and near the development site has bats, hares, many wild birds (owls, marsh harriers, house martins etc) and deer.
16 : Tick box not completed. – N/a none found during our survey, we complied with validation requirements.

2: 6176/01D Floor Plans, Elevations & Block Plan

Proposed Site Plan 1:500
Drawing incorrect and with omissions, see **3 B** below

3 :6176/02 Site Plan & Block Plan

A : Existing Site Plan 1:500
The Western Boundary as drawn is incorrect. The boundary runs in a straight line from the concrete post at the furthest point north through a party wall forming a courtyard that has been omitted from the drawing and on through multiple concrete posts to Station Road. The hedge shown forming the boundary between Nos 41 and 39 is wholly owned by No39 and is scheduled for removal as it is dying. See **Appendix 1** Photos 1 through 4.
A wall attached to the southern elevation of No 41 is not shown and a courtyard attached to the workshop/garage does not appear **See Appendix 2** and **Appendix 1** photos 1 through 4and 10. – The courtyard isn't shown as this part of the site wasn't surveyed in detail as it affected by the proposal, not relevant to this application. The western boundary is not affected by this proposal. However if planner wishes a fence can be added.
B : :Proposed Site Plan 1:500
The errors described in A above have been repeated. – See above.
C : Location Plan 1:1250

The errors described in A above have been repeated. – See above.

4 : Design and Access Statement & Flood Risk Assessment Peter Humphrey Associates

Introduction

Paragraph 4

The Development Area Boundary appears to include land classified as Undevelopable and Unsuitable by the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee. Please see Appendix 3. – Site is still within DAB.

Design and Scale

Paragraph 4

The size of the proposed application site 1,082 sqm does not agree with the Flood Risk Assessment Document provided by Ellingham Consulting Ltd. – Site area has been checked and it is correct on application form, FRA has been amended.

Access and Parking

Paragraph 1

The new access is sited directly opposite four Victorian dwellings(two sets of semi detached). Nos 60, 62 and 64 have no parking available and park all their vehicles on the road outside their houses. No 66 has one parking space to the side of the building. All visitors must park on the road. Station road is often reduced to one lane from No 50 through 68. Four accidents have occurred this year to the two cars owned by No 64, one was written off. The existing access is opposite the access of no 68, cars do not park there, it affords good visibility when the hedges are kept clipped. – OK, but that is no the applicant's problem, this is the nature of the road, this proposal improves visibility and highway safety from the access and moving the access 15m won't change what happens on the road in relation to road side parking.

Paragraph 2

The access may have to be shared with both No 41 and the converted Garage/Workshop H21-0725-20. A total of 8 planned for vehicles plus visitors would be using this access. Should H21-0725-20 be granted there is no document that shows where the parking will be for No 41. – Parking shown on this app is correct for the proposal on this app.

Paragraph 3

The proposed site plan illustrates two cars parked outside the new house and the shared area would not seem to be large enough to provide the turning space required for three cars to leave the plot in forward gear. Should No 41 or the converted garage erect gates on their boundaries, this would severely restrict manoeuvrability for the proposed house. – The driveway in front of converted garage offers plenty of room for parking and turning, the drive is also 4.8m wide (minimum) in front of No.41 so no pinch point.

Hard/Soft Landscaping

The Western Boundary is not to remain as existing; the site plan shows 1.8m close board fencing to be erected. – Explained earlier. Plan does not shown 1.8m fence being erected on western boundary, it says it will remain as existing…

Drainage

The existing Garage/Workshop for No 41, currently has soakaways into the back garden of the proposed development. See **Appendix 2** H21-0802-00 site plan. A further application to develop the Garage/ Workshop, H21-0725-20 will use the existing soakaways, including the new roof area.

The existing building, no 41, has a septic tank and associated leach field and soakaways that may also affect the proposed development. – Not relevant to this application.

Flood Risk Assessment

The full recommendations in the Document provided by Ellingham Consulting Ltd have not been addressed.

5 : Flood Risk Assessment Ellingham Consulting Ltd

2.2 Existing Site

The area of development 0.12 hectares (1,200 sqm) does not agree with that stated in the document preceding. – FRA has been amended.

The document as a whole does not address the soakaways from the existing buildings on the proposed development site and possible leach field. See Appendix 2.

Attachment 1 Planning Drawing 6176/01D

This drawing contains errors - see document **2** above.