PHA replies added in red 20/10/2020

Although planning permission was applied for on 02/9/2020 (amended on 14/9/2020), 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 5 – 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 five 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

4 :
The site area stated 1,585.00 sq m does not agree with the Flood Risk Assessment produced by Ellingham Consulting Ltd. Which states to site has 0.28 hectares 2,800 sq m – Site area has been checked and it is correct on application form, FRA has been amended.
6 :
The garage has been used as a building business and the upstairs is shown as an office in the existing drawings. The residential gardens and driveway have containers and a large tank of red-diesel for the large plant stored on-site. See **Appendix1** Photo 12. - OK.
8 :
This statement conflicts with proposal H21-0674-20. Should both applications succeed three separate dwellings will use the new access and eight cars are shown to use this 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.
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 :6176/02/01 Site Plan & Drawing Of Existing Building

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, that will severely impact the proposed shared driveway, is not shown and a courtyard attached to the workshop/garage does not appear **See Appendix 2** and **Appendix 1** photos 1 through 4 and 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 : Existing Floor Plans

The building as shown is not that for which permission was given in application H21-0802-00 See **Appendix 2.** This building was partly converted in the Spring of 2018 along with the site being cleared, allowing it to be used as a builders yard. This would appear to be in violation of the permissions given for the original building which state:-

2 The building shall be used for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such and shall not be used for commercial purposes.

Reason: The site is in a residential area and this condition is imposed to safeguard the amenities of properties in the vicinity.

See **Appendix 1** photos 6 ,14 and 15 – During our survey the ground floor was a garage and the first floor area was now being converted to an office, this is a legitimate use of the ancillary building to the main dwelling house. Never the less, this issue will be resolved if application is approved.

3: 6176/02/02B Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations & Block Plan

A : Proposed Site Plan 1:500

Drawing incorrect and with omissions, see **2 A** above – See above.

The plot that remains owned by No41 and the land ceded to the converted dwelling are not indicated. – Different app, for the case of the isolated garage conversion app the plan is correct.

The parking for three vehicles assumed for No41 are not shown. – Yes they are, one in garage and two in drive.

The eastern elevation of the converted dwelling appears to be a party/boundary wall to the garden of the new build proposed in H21-0674-20. This will require access from the H21-0674-20's garden for maintenance of the gable end wall and roof edge. – Not a planning issue.

It is unclear how much if any of the currently attached courtyard will remain and to whom it will belong. There is a possibility of another courtyard wall becoming a party wall. – Not a planning issue.

Two cars parked outside the converted garage/workshop are shown, the area would not seem to be large enough to turn in, given that close boarded fences are to be erected on both the east and west side of the driveway. This creates a pinch point directly outside the single attached garage of No 41. – 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.

The ownership areas of the shared driveway are unclear and accessing the attached single garage of No41 will block access to the proposed dwelling. – This is not a planning issue, its up to the owner who the shared areas are owned/controlled by.

B : Proposed Location Plan 1:1250

The errors described in **3 A** above have been repeated. – See above.

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

Introduction

Paragraph 3

This paragraph states that there will be little impact on No 41 but given that planning application H21-0674-20 has been submitted on the side garden mentioned, there will be great impact on No41. – Different application, not part of this one.

This would be a substantial change to the type of properties currently in this part of Station Road and could be seen as an overdevelopment of the plot. – Subjective comment.

Should both planning applications H21-0674-20 and H21-0725-20 be allowed the land currently described as Woodland that is owned and accessed by the current

resident of No41, will become orphaned and no longer accessible from No41. The maintenance of what are now substantial trees that back onto many homes on the west side of Long Road would become difficult. – Final ownership of the orchard is down to land owner, who has the right to decide which development it is sold with.
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 2
The exact plot that will comprise the proposed converted dwelling, garden and driveway is not shown. The area that will be used for parking the existing three vehicles for No 41 is not shown. This paragraph states that both No41 and the new dwelling will have ample driveways and private garden spaces although this possibility is not shown. – As explained earlier, the apps have been kept separate but the two proposals work together if both are approved, the info from one app and cannot be shown on another.
The privacy of all three proposed dwellings on the existing site of No 41 will be compromised, along with the privacy of No39. All three building along the building line will have their back gardens and rooms on their north sides overlooked by the bedrooms of the conversion. The conversion will be overlooked by three buildings; No41 has a large window in the northern elevation that was specifically included to look into the courtyard, garage/workshop and gardens to the north side of the existing dwelling. – The proposal will have no impact on No.39, it's the whole depth of No.41 from the boundary which is also densely landscaped.
No39 will now have two separate dwellings on its eastern boundary with the increased noise and intrusion this will entail, especially as there is no fencing of the

proposed garden for the converted new dwelling in the planning application. The existing courtyard attached to the Garage/Workshop is not shown in any proposed plans, if removal of the courtyard is planned (which will entail removal of a party wall) there will not be any of the gardens and windows of the converted dwelling that will not be seen by inhabitants of No39 and their visitors.
See **Appendix 1** photos 1, 3, 6, 12 and 13. - It doesn't state anywhere in the submission that courtyard area is being removed, no works are taking place in this area, hence no detail on the plan.

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 proposed New House H21-0674-20. A total of eight 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 will be sited. – Parking for No.41 is shown on both apps respective of what is being proposed under that app.
Paragraph 3
The proposed site plan illustrates two cars parked outside the converted garage/workshop and the area showing the two cars parked would not seem to large enough to turn in; given that close boarded fences are to be erected on both the east and west side of the driveway. This creates a pinch point directly outside the single attached garage of No 41. Getting a car in and out of that garage may also be difficult. – Already covered this point earlier.
The shared access area shown in H21-0674-20 would not seem to be large enough to provide the turning space required for three cars to leave the plot in forward gear. Given the close boarded fence proposed between the new house and the conversion, it will be quite difficult to see any cars coming down from the converted garage/workshop and the three cars for No41. Should No 41 or the converted garage erect gates on their boundaries, this would severely restrict manoeuvrability for the new house proposed in H21-0674-20. – Already covered this point earlier.
H-21-0674-20 Page 7 of 26 29 September 2020

Hard/Soft Landscaping
The 'Western Boundary as existing' leaves the garden of the proposed conversion totally exposed to the inhabitants of No39 See **Appendix 1** photo 12 and 13. – No changes are proposed on this half of plot, however if planner wishes a fence can be added.

Drainage
The existing Garage/Workshop for No 41 has soakaways into the back garden of the proposed development H21-0674-20. See **Appendix 2** H21-0802-00 site plan.
This application to develop the Garage/ Workshop, H21-0725-20 will use the existing soakaways, including for the new roof area and will discharge into an area that may belong to a proposed new neighbour.
The existing building, no 41, has a septic tank and associated leach field and soakaways that may also affect the proposed development. – The existing soakaway and septic tank will be reused and checked at building regs stage by building control.

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 sq m) does not agree with that stated in the application document question 4 -.1,585 sq m – 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**. Nor is the planning proposal H21-0674-20 addressed.
5.2 Mitigation Measures
Paragraph 5 recommends surface water run-off to soakaways using BRE365 design so as not to affect adjoining properties, this is not what is stated in the Design & Access Statement & Flood Risk Assessment submitted by Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd. This document states that the water will run into soakaways in the gardens of another proposed house – H21-0674-20.

Attachment 1 Planning Drawing 6176/01D
This drawing contains errors - see D**ocument 2** above.