

Consultee Comments

Place Directorate  
Lancaster House  
36 Orchard Street  
Lincoln LN1 1XX  
Tel: (01522) 782070



To: Lincoln City Council

Application Ref: 2020/0134/HOU

Description of development

**Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU).**

Address or location

**4 Limelands, Lincoln, Lincolnshire, LN2 4AR**

With reference to the above application received 6 March 2020

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority:

**Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.**

NO OBS

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.

Case Officer:  
*Helen Patchett*  
for Warren Peppard  
Head of Development

Date: 24 March 2020

## **Taylor, Louise (City of Lincoln Council)**

---

**From:** Walker, Dave (City of Lincoln Council)  
**Sent:** 16 March 2020 10:49  
**To:** Technical Team (City of Lincoln Council)  
**Subject:** 2020/0134/HOU - 4 Limelands

**Categories:** Louise Taylor

Dear Development team .

I have examined the submitted material for this application and have the following observations:

The tree survey undertaken to support this application was originally used to support 2019/0446/HOU; the encroachment figures identified in section 4 of the report are therefore no longer accurate.

Drawing number 5 (Submitted for this renewed application) shows that the footprint of the newly proposed extension avoids encroachment within root protection areas of trees contained within the applicants property boundary.

The following points which I submitted for application 2019/0446/HOU remain valid:

- Tree roots are susceptible to anaerobic conditions brought about by unregulated surface level changes and therefore arising's must not be stored or spread in the root protection area of any tree that is to be retained.
- The arboricultural assessment submitted by the applicant is detailed and contains suitable damage mitigation methods intended to protect trees that are identified for retention on site, recommendations for tree works are suitable and well considered.

Other than the above points I have no objection to the applicants proposals

If you require any further guidance or more information regarding my findings please don't hesitate to ask

Dave Walker  
**Arboricultural Officer**  
T 07970 225061



## Written Representations

### **Application Summary**

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU).

Case Officer: null

### **Customer Details**

Name: Mr ANDREW EDMONDSON

Address: Eastwood Coach House Greetwell Road lincoln

### **Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I note that this revised application involves single storey development and therefore I cannot now realistically object on visual impact grounds as I essentially will not see the development from my property.

However I do object, as I did on the previous application, to the legality of the development i.e. when the land on which the bungalow was built was sold in 1968 the Conveyance imposed restrictions on what development could take place next to the existing boundary. This is more fully explained in the comments you received from my neighbour, Richard Coy to the original application.

I understand you do not consider this to be a planning issue but it is important to make the point so that, in the event that you decided to grant permission, the applicant would be aware that he could/would face a legal challenge.

## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU).

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Ms Cate WABY

Address: Lincoln Civic Trust 385 High Street LINCOLN

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Amenity Group

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:OBJECTION

This application is an overdevelopment of the site and encroaches too close to the boundary of Eastbrooke House. It is virtually doubling the size of the existing dwelling and "appears" to be a totally separate unit. Furthermore it will require substantial work to remove and safeguard the bank which holds Greetwell Road and the very important tree line of that road and there does not appear to be any engineering specifications for achieving this. The existing garage is a flat roof and this whole development is using a pitched roof which will substantially raise the profile of the building area.

We feel this application is an over-development of the site, designed without any consideration for the neighbouring properties and poorly presented and would request that it be refused

## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU).

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Coy

Address: Flat 2, Eastwood House, 2 Greetwell Road Lincoln, Lincolnshire LN2 4AQ

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

Objection to Planning Application: 2020/0134/HOU resubmission of 2019/0446/HOU - 4  
Limelands, Lincoln, LN2 4AR

Dear Mr Manning,

We write to oppose the proposed development at 4 Limelands, Lincoln.

We live at 2 Eastwood House. This is a private dwelling which is shown on the applicant's Location Plan as the property which borders the applicant's existing garden. 1 Eastwood House borders the applicant's existing bungalow. Both of the Eastwood House properties overlook the applicant's existing flat roofed garage.

Eastwood House was built over 100 years ago. Limelands was developed in the late 1960s/early 1970s and comprises of a mixture of houses and bungalows. The bungalows, which include 4 Limelands, were built nearest to Eastwood House, the houses further away behind large screening trees in order to prevent any possibility of the new structures being overbearing or intrusive to the existing Eastwood House. The houses, whilst being carefully placed further from the existing Eastwood House, were also built side on so as to prevent further intrusion.

Our opposition to the proposed development numbered 2020/0134/HOU using the current material

planning considerations are:

1) Loss of Light.

The proposed development, by virtue of its ten meter height, depth, associated bulk and design would appear overbearing and visually intrusive to the occupiers of this property. In particular when viewed from its front facing main windows and garden. Specifically, the lounge, dining room bay window and decking - all of which are on the ground floor and the master bedroom. Eastwood House is built on much higher ground than 4 Limelands which is built in a dip. There would be loss of privacy. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the amenities currently enjoyed by this property. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the Policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017.

2) Loss of Privacy.

Due to the extremely close proximity of the proposed development to the Eastwood House/4 Limelands existing boundary fence, this proposal although reduced in height from that previously submitted would have an overbearing and visually intrusive impact and would considerably reduce the daylight and direct sunlight on a large area of the garden. This proposal increases the floor space of this bungalow by approximately one hundred and twenty percent. Its design is also at odds with the design of Limelands. As previously mentioned all dwellings on Limelands are sympathetically sited to avoid overlooking Eastwood House and its surrounds. This application is designed not only to be immediately adjacent to Eastwood House but also to directly face it. This proposal would therefore result in a significant detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjacent property and would fail to comply with the Policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017.

3) Design and Amenity.

Apart from the addition of one bedroom to the existing bungalow, the rest of the proposal is clearly a separate and independent unit built within the garden, with totally independent access from the current garden but none from the proposed bedroom extension. As two separate properties, it would be discordant with the character of the area and potentially harmful to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties. There is no apparent domestic rationale why this applicant, having only bought this property some twenty four months ago would need to more than double its size. Again, this fails to comply with the policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017.

4) Loss of Trees.

When 4 Limelands was marketed just prior to its sale to the applicant on 3 January 2018, the estate agents took a series of photographs. These pictures clearly show several mature trees growing directly where this proposed development is sited. (Appendix 1, pages 1 and 2. Source: Right Move contained in original objections to 2019/0446/HPU as are all other Appendix references). The height and scale of the trees is also shown in a photograph taken from 2 Eastwood House shortly before the applicant moved to 4 Limelands. (Appendix 1, page 3. Source: author of this letter). The tree survey dated 22nd March 2019, commissioned by the applicant and submitted to City of Lincoln Council, makes no reference to the existence of these trees. The applicant clearly had them felled and the site cleared before commissioning the tree survey in an attempt prevent the failure of this application due to the existence of the mature trees. The impact this clearance has had on our enjoyment of our property can be seen in a photograph shown at Appendix 1, page 4 (Source: author of this letter). Furthermore, the tree survey itself is flawed in that it makes no reference whatsoever to the damage that will be caused to the existing trees on our land immediately adjacent to the proposed development. Both the felling of mature trees and lack of focus on existing adjacent trees is clearly at odds with the Policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

#### 5) Landscaping

The submitted Level Survey, which is anonymously authored, shows the topography of the area where the proposed development will be sited. It is clear from the survey that in order to make the site flat, the steep upward incline leading from the existing bungalow will have to be removed. There are no accompanying surveyor's reports detailing how the land around the excavation will be supported, either during the excavation or on its completion. Obviously, our land shares the same features as that bank, but again, no mention is made as to the likely effect the build and excavation will have on our land, our existing garage or the stability of the steep hill on our side of the fence. We have already commented that the Tree Surveys only focus is on those trees growing on the applicants land ignoring those growing nearer to the proposed development on neighbouring land. The omission of any survey whatsoever which states unequivocally how the applicant plans to prevent subsidence and guarantees stability of both their and neighbouring properties is disquieting.

#### 6) Non Material Considerations. Existence of Conveyance

The original development of Limelands has already been briefly mentioned in this letter. The land where the bungalows and houses now stand was sold by the then owner of Eastwood House, Reginald Yelloly, to a Mr and Mrs Barraclough.

On 8th March 1968, they signed and sealed a Conveyance. (Contained at Appendix 2, pages 1-13 (Documents served as objection to 2019/0446/HOU. Original held by Sills and Betteridge, Solicitors). This Conveyance covers the terms and conditions of the sale. Page 10, paragraph 11 of the Conveyance gives the details of what can and cannot be built within certain distances from

the boundary of both 2 and 1 Eastwood House. There are three separate stipulations.

- No structure whatsoever can be built within 10 feet of the boundary.
- No structure other than a flat roofed garage may be built within a further fifteen feet of the initial ten foot restriction.
- Only bungalows, single storey garages and outoffices can be built outside of the second boundary in a clearly marked area.

The map outlining the physical borders of these restrictions is at Appendix 2, page 5.

The Conveyance prevents the proposed extension to the bungalow due to its position in relation to Eastwood House.

Yours sincerely

Richard Coy Deborah Coy



## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU).

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Mr Kenneth Hume

Address: Flat 1, Eastwood House 2, Greetwell Road Lincoln

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Mr Manning

Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU. 4 Limelands, Lincoln, LN2 4AR

We are writing to object to the recent planning application for 4 Limelands.

We reside to the east of the property and our boundary is directly adjacent to the proposed development.

Yet again, the applicant seems to have submitted a wholly inappropriate scheme, lacking detail and important additional information.

1. The design more than doubles the footprint of the existing property and is totally out of keeping with the rest of Limelands.
2. The proposed new building runs right up to the boundary of our own and our neighbour's property (1 and 2 Eastwood House) and all the rear floor to ceiling windows look directly into our gardens. In addition to substantial privacy issues, it is inevitable that noise disturbance will also increase significantly. We note there are no windows however on the elevation facing into Limelands, giving a permanent and unpleasant view of a large expanse of brick wall to the residents of Limelands.
3. As mentioned above, the scale and design of the extension does not compliment any element of the existing scheme.
4. We made reference in our previous submission, to our serious concerns around the project cutting into the slope running down from Greetwell Road. A large amount of soil removal will be required which will affect the stability of the slope and footpath on Greetwell Road. Why is there no engineer's report or any indication as to how they will stabilise the ground?
5. The proximity of the proposed extension to the electrical sub-station on the south west aspect of the property is a real concern with a substantial amount of soil needing to be removed from around the substation. This also leaves very limited access to the rear of the proposed development.

6. We note that one of the reasons for refusal of last year's application was the lack of an Archaeological Assessment. Yet again no such information is provided.

7. The layout drawings, which lack detail, do not show any connection between the extension and the existing bungalow. An indication of intent to create a second property rather than an extension?

We cannot believe this is a serious application. It is totally out of scale, invasive, lacks detail and appropriate information is missing. We therefore strongly request you reject the application.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

Kenneth & Ruth Hume  
1 Eastwood House  
2 Greetwell Road  
Lincoln  
LN2 4AQ

## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU).

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Mr Stuart Humphries

Address: 3 Eastwood House 2 Greetwell Rd Lincoln

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Mr Manning

RE: Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU. 4 Limelands, Lincoln

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed development for 4 Limelands.

I reside at 3 Eastwood House which overlooks the existing bungalow and the proposed development. My residence is situated along the Eastern perimeter of the 4 Limelands site.

I have a number of objections to the proposed scheme:

1) The floor plans for the proposed development suggest that there would be no internal access between the one bedroom unit and the rest of the extension. I cannot therefore understand how a simple residential extension could function in this way. I can only conclude that the intention is to create two separate properties. This would lead to overdevelopment of the Limelands site.

2) The proposed extension is significantly larger than the current property. It is therefore out of scale and proportion to the site itself and the rest of the Limelands development.

In addition, the other bungalows along the Eastern aspect of the Limelands turning all share a similar orientation. The proposed extension is at odds with this harmonious layout.

3) The proposed site plans would situate the extension in extreme close proximity to the boundaries of my residence. Combined with the multiple sets of floor to ceiling bifold doors I would anticipate that the level of noise and disturbance towards my residence would be significant. The orientation of the extension would simply exacerbate this issue.

4) I would like to draw your attention to Section 6 'Trees and Hedges' on the Application form for this proposed development which has been completed by the applicant.

In response to the question 'Are there any trees or hedges on your own property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your proposed development?' the applicant has answered 'No'. I believe this to be factually incorrect and misleading.

There are multiple mature trees around the boundary of the proposed development which are within falling distance.

In response to the question 'Will any trees or hedges need to be removed or pruned in order to carry out your proposal' the applicant has answered 'No'. Again, I believe this to be factually incorrect and misleading. The development itself and its construction is highly likely to result in damage to existing trees. I note that the applicant has already removed a number of trees on the site for the proposed development.

In addition, the tree report makes no contingency for the possibility of the presence of nesting birds.

5) The designs for the proposed extension suggest that there would be a complete lack of windows or doors on the South

and South West aspects which would result in a solid brick wall facing into the Limelands development. This is aesthetically highly unpleasant.

6) I am deeply concerned by the amount of landscaping and soil removal that will be required for the development. This will be in very close proximity to the electric substation resulting in possible damage which would have consequences to many people. The risk of subsidence to the Greetwell Rd footpath has not been professionally assessed.

I therefore ask you to reject the application for this ill conceived development.

Yours sincerely

Stuart Humphries

3 Eastwood House  
2 Greetwell Rd  
Lincoln  
LN2 4AQ

**Taylor, Louise (City of Lincoln Council)**

---

**From:** David Featherstone [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2020 10:44  
**To:** Technical Team (City of Lincoln Council)  
**Subject:** 4 Limelands, Lincoln LN2 4AR

Ref. 2020/0134/HOU

Dear Sir,

We are the owners of Haneish House, 2 Greetwell Road, Lincoln LN2 4AQ which we purchased in 1992 on the understanding we would never be overlooked by properties in Limelands.

We feel the planning application for 4 Limelands is out of keeping with the original plans for Limelands which, I believe, were covered by a covenant when the land was developed from Eastwood House.

From the planning application, Eastwood House would be overlooked by large windows whilst not affecting Haneish House would give a precedent for other properties in Limelands in the future.

The proposed soil excavation would not only spoil the aesthetics of Limelands but also create structural problems for the electric substation and eventually the pavement and highway.

This application we believe to be most inappropriate for Limelands and should be rejected.

Yours Sincerely,

David and Margaret Featherstone

## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU) (Revised)

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Mr andrew edmondson

Address: Eastwood Coach House Greetwell Road LINCOLN

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This is now the third application regarding this development and I do not see any material change with this submission and therefore I continue to oppose the application.

The first application was rejected because of (1) the scale and type of development and (2) assessments regarding ground contamination and archaeology were not presented.

This second point is for you as Planners to address but as I cannot see any assessments as part of this submission, your stance on this is presumably unaltered.

Regarding the first point - Although the proposed "extension" has been reduced it still represents a doubling of the property. There is now an internal connection to the existing property but it still seems to me that the proposal is still an attempt to have a separate building on the site; what is to stop the area marked as garages to be changed in the future to living space and why does the development appear to show a kitchen area when one already exists in the property.

Granting of permission would set a precedent for the adjacent bungalow which borders our property.

## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU) (Revised)

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Mr David Featherstone

Address: Grange Farm Staunton in the Vale Nottingham

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: As the owners of Haneish House, 2 Greetwell Road, LN24AQ we would like to object to the revised plans for the following reasons:

Whilst the development at 4 Limelands is not overlooking our property it does, if passed, give a precedent for other developments on Limelands.

When our property was purchased in 1992, there was a clear understanding we would never be overlooked and this was underwritten by a conveyance from when Limelands was originally developed from land belonging to Eastwood House.

We feel the proposed design is not in keeping with the other properties on Limelands and is far too large for the land area of 4 Limelands. We therefore object strongly to the proposals.



## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU) (Revised)

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Coy

Address: Flat 2, Eastwood House, 2 Greetwell Road Lincoln, Lincolnshire LN2 4AQ

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: 2 Eastwood House

2 Greetwell Road

Lincoln

LN2 4AQ

30 November 2020

Objection to Planning Application: resubmission of 2019/0446/HOU - 4 Limelands, Lincoln, LN2 4AR

Dear Development Team,

We write to oppose the revised proposed development at 4 Limelands, Lincoln.

We live at 2 Eastwood House. This, for some reason, has been given the postal address of Flat 2.

This leads to confusion both to those in the local authority and utility companies. 2 Eastwood House is, in fact, a substantial period freehold house built on 2 floors with a cellar. Its garden borders Greetwell Road, the garden of 1 Eastwood House and, at its southern border, the applicants' property. The garden includes a garage - again situated near its southern border - the existence of which predates the Limelands development. The border shared with the applicant, is shown on the submitted plan as a light dotted line.

Next door to our house is 1 Eastwood House. This is a large, period freehold house built over 3 floors. Its southern border is shown on the applicant's plan as a heavy dotted line.

2 Eastwood House was built over 100 years ago. Limelands was developed in the late 1960s/early 1970s and comprises of a mixture of houses and bungalows. The Limelands development was built with its proximity to the Eastwood House properties in mind. The bungalows, which include

number 4, were built nearest to Eastwood House, the houses further away. Where the new buildings were going to be overlooked by Eastwood House they were angled sympathetically away from it and, where possible, built behind large screening trees in order to prevent any possibility of the new structures being overbearing or intrusive to the existing residents of 2, Eastwood House or vice versa. This decision by the developers was not made by accident. It was done to ensure that during the life of both the new development and that of 2 Eastwood House, the amenities which all current and future occupants would be reasonably expected to enjoy would continue and would not be harmed by any future development.

Our opposition to the proposed development numbered 2020/0134/HOU using the current material planning considerations are:

1. Protecting Views

Since its construction 2 Eastwood House has had a view of Lincoln Cathedral. The construction of the whole of the Limelands development did not impede this view in any way whatsoever. This proposed development, rather than either enhancing or improving this historic view, obstructs and detracts from it and fails to comply with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

2. Loss of Light.

The garden of 2 Eastwood House has existed since the house was built. It faces south with no buildings to impede light. This proposed development by virtue of its height, depth, associated bulk and design coupled with its extremely close proximity to our garden boundary would form an impenetrable and permanent screen preventing any mid afternoon to evening light from falling on the southern part of our garden. It would not affect the applicants' garden in any way.

3. Impact on residential amenity.

It can be argued that this proposed development would not lead to a loss of privacy to the occupiers of properties on Limelands because of distance and existing physical boundaries. It is stated by an officer of the City of Lincoln planning department writing of a site visit following the applicant's first application that, " To the East of the application property is the large detached property known as Eastwood House which is sub divided into flats." This is clearly based on an assumption and is completely erroneous. Both Number 1 and 2 Eastwood House are, as previously stated, large period freehold houses. At this point, we must reiterate that we are opposing this application as the owners of 2 Eastwood House and thus any comments made, in the main, only deal with the impact on our house and amenities.

Possibly because of this error as to the nature of the properties which form Eastwood House and their individual boundaries, the planning officer appears to believe that they are dealing with multi leasehold premises and continues, "The closest part of Eastwood House to the proposed triple garage and annex would be an existing detached garage to the southern corner. Despite a difference in land levels, which sees Eastwood House positioned higher than the application property, this is an existing and established relationship that would not be significantly altered by the proposed development certainly not to the extent that would be considered detrimental to the

amenities which all and future occupants of the application property and neighbouring properties at Eastwood House may reasonably expect to enjoy".

This is a highly flawed statement. The well thought out harmony of the design of Limelands, ensuring that the amenities previously enjoyed by the owners of 2 Eastwood House would continue following the building of Limelands has already been explored. How could this application not be detrimental to the enjoyment of future amenities? At present, our southern boundary borders what it has bordered for 120 years - nothing. How can it be claimed that a development of this size would not be not be detrimental to us?

The proposed development falls in its entirety on our border. In fact, it is only one meter from it. We could touch the proposed ground floor extension from our garden. There would be no conversation conducted in our garden that could not be overheard within this proposed development and vice versa. Modern housing developments, although generally built without the generous garden we enjoy, are not constructed so that a house at the bottom of the garden can be within touching distance of its neighbouring fence. In fact, the norm is surely to try to ensure that houses are built to meet garden to garden and not garden to house. We are at a loss to understand how the planning department believe that this development, by virtue of its height, depth, associated bulk and design would not appear overbearing and visually intrusive to the occupiers of our property.

By the nature of its design, all of the main family rooms of our property face south. Only 2 bedrooms, a study and bathroom face away from Limelands. Clearly, this was a deliberate decision by the designer as it means that all of our main rooms - which have very large windows, both bay and otherwise - overlook the garden and views of the cathedral. So, specifically the lounge, dining room, master bedroom, kitchen and decking as well as the entire garden area will be affected detrimentally if this so called extension is built. There cannot be anything other than a loss of privacy. The proposal would be detrimental to the amenities currently enjoyed by this property and therefore fails to comply with the Policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017.

#### 4. Design and Amenity.

This is the third set of un-authored plans submitted by the applicant to the City of Lincoln planning department. Although superficially different because of a gradual decrease in length, the rest of the proposal is essentially the same and still clearly indicates an ultimate desire to create a separate and independent unit built within the current garden. The current application has been tweaked to show access to the existing property, whereas the previous submissions showed none. This, in reality, is the only variance and is duplicitous.

Since buying the premises in 2018 the applicant has spent thousands of pounds renovating it. (Source Right Move, January 2018 and October 2020). She has opened up and installed a new kitchen, constructed a new shower room and renovated a further bathroom. If all the applicant

wants is more space for herself, as the newly submitted plans indicate, why in a property of this size, built on one level is there a need for another substantial kitchen, less than 8 meters from the newly upgraded one?

The applicant has an existing garage which is not used to park cars. They are either parked in the driveway or on the adjoining road. Furthermore, it is clear that the area marked as Garage One and Garage Two on the current application, could easily be converted into a living area. Above this space is an area marked Balcony/Snug. Again, this is discordant with a space below being used as an unheated garage.

If the applicant were to assert that this addition is to be used as an annex for a member of her family, it is an extraordinarily large and generous one - having intended floor space which exceeds that of her current property.

More importantly, if the applicant's desire is genuinely simply to increase the floor space of her existing property (and not to build a separate and independent dwelling which can later be sold as such) there is sufficient ground to build an extension of similar proportions to this application to the front of her existing property. An extension on this ground could easily (and would have to be) incorporated into her existing bungalow. It would be difficult to convert it into a separate and independent residential unit - unlike the current application which would simply involve removing a small flat roofed area to create two completely separate and independent dwellings. This is clearly why this option has not been proposed.

The proposed double garage and extension by virtue of its siting, height, scale and mass is not ancillary to the application property but rather intended as a separate and residential unit within the garden, conflicting with the area and harmful to the residential amenities of 2 Eastwood House - contrary to the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017.

#### 5. Loss of Trees.

In our objections to both of the previous applications, we have dealt with the applicants deceitful felling of trees before commissioning the current excellent tree survey of her property. There is still no survey commissioned by the applicant dealing with trees on our property adjoining the area where the proposed development is sited.

#### 6. Landscaping

There are still no accompanying surveyor's reports detailing how the land around the excavation will be supported, either during the excavation or on its completion. The lack of a report stating unequivocally how the applicant plans to prevent subsidence and guaranteeing the stability of both their and the neighbouring grounds/property is disquieting.

## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU) (Revised)

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Mr Kenneth Hume

Address: Flat 1 , Eastwood House 2 Greetwell Road Lincoln

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Mr Kenneth Hume 1 Eastwood House 2 Greetwell Road Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AQ

Comment submitted date: Monday 30th November 2020

Objection to planning application Ref 2020/0134/HOU 4 Limelands Lincoln LN2 4AR

Dear Mr Manning

I am writing in respect of your letter dated 18th November and to object to the proposed development at the above property.

1 Eastwood House is to the east of 4 Limelands and our boundary is directly adjacent to the proposed development. Our objections to the above planning application are as follows:

1. Although the development appears smaller than in the previous application, it still doubles the size of the existing property and leaves a footprint which is wholly inappropriate to the dimensions of the plot.
2. The scale and design does not compliment the existing scheme and lacks consideration to neighbouring properties.
3. A flat roof garage will be demolished to be replaced by a pitched roof garage and extension linked to the existing property. This will obviously give increased height overall, especially with the increased footprint of the garage and extension. We also note the presence of stairs in the plans of the garage/extension leading to a snug/balcony. We would not expect this feature above a garage. Looking at the plans, we conclude this appears to be a thinly disguised attempt to create a second, separate and independent property here.
4. The proposed new build runs close to the boundary of our own property and that of 2 Eastwood House. There are rear floor to ceiling windows which look directly into our garden. In addition to loss of light and privacy issues, it is inevitable that noise disturbance will also increase significantly. In the plans, there are no windows facing towards Limelands. This is an unsightly design and will give a permanent view of a large expanse of brickwork to other residents.

5. We have serious concerns around the project cutting into the slope to the south and west of the property. Adjacent to the electrical substation and to the rear of the proposed development, we note heights of slope of 1.827m, 1.838, 1.833 and 1.730. Significant amounts of soil will be removed and yet no indication on how the remaining ground is to be supported and retained.

Where is the structural engineers report in relation to this?

6. A reason for the refusal of a previous application was the lack of an Archaeological report. Yet again no report is forthcoming.

7. We note the Environmental Health report dated 9/4/20 states there is former land fill within 60 meters of the proposed development and that no development should take place until an investigation and risk assessment has been completed to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site. No such risk assessment or investigation report has been provided. This application is totally out of scale and is invasive and unsympathetic to neighbouring properties. It lacks significant detail and appropriate information is missing. The proposed extension is out of character with the neighbouring properties and we strongly request you reject the application

Kind regards

Kenneth & Ruth Hume

## Comments for Planning Application 2020/0134/HOU

### Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0134/HOU

Address: 4 Limelands Lincoln Lincolnshire LN2 4AR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey extension (resubmission 2019/0446/HOU) (Revised)

Case Officer: Tom Hobson

### Customer Details

Name: Mr Stuart Humphries

Address: 3 Eastwood House 2 Greetwell Rd Lincoln

### Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing to strongly object to the revised planning application for 4 Limelands Ref 2020/0134/HOU

The revised plans fail to address the objections from my previous comment dated 21 March 2020.

Namely:

- 1) The proposed design is out of scale and proportion to the existing dwelling and the neighboring properties of the Limelands site.
- 2) The plans suggest that there will be a small connecting unit between the existing property and the main extension. I believe that this unit could be very easily removed in the future thereby creating two separate properties. This will lead to overdevelopment of the Limelands site.
- 3) There is no archaeological assessment.
- 4) The proposed design situates the new extension in very close proximity to the existing electric substation. I am very concerned that there would be a high risk of damage to this substation during construction which would have a detrimental effect upon many people.
- 5) The revised design features floor to ceiling bifold doors facing my residence. Consequently I fear that there will be significant noise and disturbance as the proposed extension is in extreme close proximity to my property boundary.

6) Construction of the extension would require extensive landscaping and soil removal. The effects of this upon surrounding gardens, trees and the Greetwell Rd footpath has not been professionally assessed.

I therefore ask you to reject this revised application..

Yours sincerely  
Stuart Humphries  
3 Eastwood House  
2 Greetwell Rd  
Lincoln  
LN2 4AQ