

Consultee Responses

Arboricultural Officer (Mick Albans)

Further to your request for me to consider the proposed development of land to the rear of 78 Hykeham Road, I submit the following observations for your consideration.

I visited the site on December 12th 2018 after reading the applicant's Design and Access Statement, Arboricultural Report and Impact Assessment and the Arboricultural Method Statement.

I consider the applicant's Arboricultural Report and Impact Statement to be a fair and accurate assessment of the trees located adjacent to the site and the possible effects of development on the site.

I also consider the Arboricultural Method Statement and the recommendations therein to be appropriate and sufficient to protect the trees from any potential adverse effects of the development.

I note in particular the proposed protection of Scots Pine T6 and T7 by the installation of protective fencing and ground protection boards prior to any storage of plant, materials and machinery and the start of any construction. I also note in relation to the access driveway the proposed installation of 'no dig' hard surfacing within the root protection area.

I therefore recommend that the tree protection methods as outlined in the applicant's Arboricultural Report, Impact Assessment and Method Statement are the subject of a condition for any subsequent approval granted in relation to this planning application.

Lincolnshire County Council (Highway Authority & Lead Local Flood Authority)

Having given due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance (in particular the National Planning Policy Framework), Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has concluded that the proposed development is acceptable and accordingly, does not wish to object to this planning application.

HI08

Please contact the Lincolnshire County Council Streetworks and Permitting Team on 01522 782070 to discuss any proposed statutory utility connections and any other works which will be required within the public highway in association with the development permitted under this Consent. This will enable Lincolnshire County Council to assist in the coordination and timings of these works.

Lincolnshire Police (response has not changed from the original to the revised proposals)

Thank you for your correspondence and opportunity to comment on the proposed

development.

Lincolnshire Police has no formal objection to this application.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you need further information or clarification.

Crime prevention advice is given free without the intention of creating a contract. Neither the Home Office nor the Police Service takes any legal responsibility for the advice given. However, if the advice is implemented it will reduce the opportunity for crimes to be committed.

Yours sincerely,

John Manuel MA BA (Hons) PGCE PG CPR Dip Bus.

Force Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO)

Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board

The board has no comments on this application.

Neighbour Comments

Revised Scheme

Mr. K. Dunn (20 Somersby Close)

Further to my previous response, on looking at the revised plans I note that the boundary line drawn in red indicates that the trees at the bottom of 20 Somersby close are within the land owned by 78 Hykeham road. This is incorrect and on inspection the trees are all within the boundary garden of Somersby close and there is an existing fence in Hykeham road which confirms this. Therefore the boundary line needs to be re drawn. I confirm that the trees at the bottom of Somersby are to remain intact with no removal and to a height of at least six meters.

Mr. P. Bedson (22 Somersby Close)

I have previously commented in respect of this application and the treatment of the boundaries, but, now an amended a plan has been submitted I have further concerns.

It now appears that the dwelling will be larger than first intended with an integral garage, although it is not clear if any windows or patio-doors will be sited on the rear of the property which will face our land. As a result we feel that the proposal will now impact the bottom of our land and in turn have a detrimental effect on our privacy and possible the drainage of any rainwater, which, at present is an issue towards the plot in question.

We also have concerns that the dwelling will only be sited 1m from our boundary and given the narrow driveway accessing the plot this may cause an issue if ever fire & rescue vehicles were needed. As stated in other comments, previous applications from other applicants have been refused siting privacy as a reason for refusal for both present and future residents, therefore this should be a factor when deciding the outcome of the plans.

Mr. D. Clapham (67 Hykeham Road, owner of Nos. 78 and 80 Hykeham Road)

i am looking over the plans as of yet can not find alterations but will email you as and when i find relivant content to report.
Found.

please alter the complaint to reflect 78 and 80 being i own both properties and the proposed development will effect both.

Firstly given the large trees in my garden and there position to the vacinity of the plot and boundry i would like to know how they will run both services and a suer drain down the lane with out some removal of roots wich intern could make any trees unstable.

Continued Drive Gravel how will prequations be taken to prevent damage of underlying roots given gravel could sink further and further over the years.

Secondly on the tree survey there is a orange highlighted area this is in no way the acual boundry it is much smaller.

Thirdly the tree survey states no macinery will enter yet the trees have been cut using cherry picker and shredder.

(1.4 Details of Consent 1.4.1 Planning consent is subject to this method statement being agreed upon in advance by the Local Planning Authority. The contents of this report must be adhered to, before, during, and after the construction phase. 1.4.2 As such, no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site in connection with the development until this arboricultural method statement detailing tree management and tree protection measures has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.)

Mick Alburns Comments

(I note in particular the proposed protection of Scots Pine T6 and T7 by the installation of protective fencing and ground protection boards prior to any storage of plant, materials and machinery and the start of any construction. I also note in relation to the access driveway the proposed installation of 'no dig' hard surfacing within the root protection area)

Contaminants

i have previously informed of garages and a buss depo unfotanatly the two elderly people that have the information have passed away i would suggest that by default its

assumed commercial use was in place and if a test is done this will prove or disprove the matter.)

i note the new application states no 3 times that no contaminants are present (14 existing use)

Contaminated Land

It is noted from historical maps that the site previously had buildings on it and from historical records it appears that the buildings were used as garages. However, there is no further information as to whether the garages were domestic or commercial in nature. It is therefore recommended that the applicant be requested to complete a screening assessment form for contamination to enable a decision as to whether contaminated land needs to be considered in greater detail through planning conditions.

Police

I note that the police have commented yet this is based on the first application of erection of a 2 story in the garden of 78 and not land to the rear of .

Fire

i can not see a fire report. surely a fire report is way more important.

i can not comment on the following as will not open (COMMUNITY CONTRACTS EMAIL)

I would ask that the legal boundary be checked against the plans as previously 2 false inaccurate surveys have been drawn up and the original boundary was agreed by solicitors my side and Taylor Lindsay and in accordance with Raymond Phillips of Walters Rural. if you require further details.

previous planning.

i have already stated that an attempt some years ago to erect the previous bungalow when i phoned in to Taylor Lindsay was told footings have been put in i then called the planning and was told no blue paper so any works don't count.

i would recommend that any excavation concrete or drainage if not inspected or any paper trail the following statement from Taylor Lindsay be dismissed and removed.

(5.0 PLANNING HISTORY: 5.1 The site has previously been granted planning permission for a single dwelling and detached garage under application reference no. LH11/0527/93. This planning permission, to the best of our knowledge, was implemented by site clearance, excavations begun, and drainage installed.)

including there may be further comments brought before you but i feel very strongly this should be refused and that the evidence states this i further feel that everything that has been said still stands as although a dormer bungalow is a bungalow it still has two floors and as such the ceiling heights will be similar to a two story house and given the application should be viewed and considered as if all boundaries have low fencing there is potential for the upper floor to over look the rear gardens of 6 families.

if you require any further comments please contact me here or urgent important matters

Original Scheme

Mr. C. Jackson (84 Hykeham Road)

Concerns regarding the property overlooking my own, Scale & height of property. Effects on trees as I have observed that several large conifers have been felled very

recently. Noise & disturbance from construction and also from occupants. Aesthetics & design.

Miss. L. Cotton (72 Hykeham Road)

I have no objection to the principle of developing the site, however I would like to object to the current proposals and respectfully ask that consideration is given to the following points.

1. Privacy.
 - 1.1. The proposed dwelling is orientated such that the front windows face the rear elevation of No.72 Hykeham Road and the gardens of 68, 70 and 72. The planned dwelling would provide direct line of sight to the kitchen and living space of No.72 and we would urge the planning officer and the developer to give this consideration before granting permission.
2. Boundary Treatments.
 - 2.1. The application includes no details of the proposed boundary treatments and the planning officer should note that the existing fence which belongs to the development site is largely missing or is formed of a mixture of post and wire and sparse trees/shrubs.
 - 2.2. The proposed access road to the dwelling is approximately 50m long and runs alongside the garden of No.72 Hykeham Road, a family home with pets and young children who regularly use the garden. We would respectfully urge the planning officer and the developer to consider the safety of the neighbours as there is the potential for vehicles to reach hazardous speeds on the road with inadequate physical barrier.
 - 2.3. The lack of a solid boundary between the dwelling and the garden of No.72 would also affect the private use of the garden for occupants of both dwellings.
 - 2.4. It is considered that a close boarded fence should be provided to address these points.
3. Safe Vehicular Access.
 - 3.1. It is questioned whether the access arrangements afford those exiting the site with appropriate visibility when exiting the driveway. The access is close to a bus stop and visibility is reduced by the established hedge and lighting column immediately east of the entranceway. The placement of the bins on collection day will also impinge access to the new dwelling and No.72.
 - 3.2. Emergency access to the dwelling would require a wide road for appropriate vehicles (fire tender) and it is queried whether this is being provided by the proposals.
4. Stability of adjacent garage.

4.1. The new driveway access runs immediately alongside the garage of No.72 Hykeham Road and it concerns the residents that the use of the driveway for construction traffic and heavy deliveries or emergency vehicles may compromise the integrity of the garage structure.

Separate Further Comment:

On review of the application form, soakaway drainage is proposed. It does not appear that there is adequate space on the site to accommodate soakaways with the necessary offsets from the buildings and boundaries

Mr. K. Dunn (20 Somersby Grove)

I do not outright object to the proposed plans other than on the grounds of existing privacy making a stipulation the boundary trees at the rear of the garden between 20 Somersby Close In68af and the proposed development remain intact and in particular at their current height of approx. six meters tall. Should this not be the case then my stance would be changed from neutral to objection.

Mr. P. Bedson (22 Somersby Close)

The details of any boundary treatments are not mentioned and the existing fencing is largely missing, the boundary at the edge of our land is, as far as we can see, just a wire and the plan for the boundary fencing is not mentioned. We have no objections to a fence being built to the height of 7 foot also that the trees at the bottom of no 20 Somersby Close remain to enable the privacy on to both of our gardens being maintained.