

BARNOLDBY-LE-BECK PARISH COUNCIL

Mrs K Kirkham
Clerk to the Council
Telephone:
Email: BarnoldbyPC@outlook.com

14 Househams Lane
Legbourne
Louth
LN11 8LG

29th October 2020

NELC planning Department

Case Officer - Richard Limmer

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Reference: DM/0056/20/FUL

Proposal: Erect 82 dwellings to include garages, access roads and landscaping (amended site layout plans including zebra crossing, boundary treatments and plot repositions - Sept 2020.

Location: Land at Bradley Road, Barnoldby Le Beck

I can confirm that the above amended plan was discussed by Barnoldby le Beck Parish Council at their virtual meeting held on 28th October 2020. Following a review of the plans and discussion, the Parish Council unanimously agreed that their previous comments have not been addressed and maintain their previous stance to oppose this application. The Parish Council are dismayed that the number of dwellings have been increased from 66 to 82 and the further impact this will have.

Kindest Regards

Kim Kirkham
Barnolby Le Beck Parish Clerk

ITEM 1 - DM/0056/20/FUL - BRADLEY ROAD, BARNOLDBY LE BECK

Waltham Parish Council Comments – 27th October 2020

Planning Application Reference: DM/0056/20/FUL Proposal: Erect 82 dwellings to include garages, access roads and landscaping (amended site layout plans including zebra crossing, boundary treatments and plot repositions - Sept 2020) Location: Land At Bradley Road Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshire

<http://planninganddevelopment.nelincs.gov.uk/online-applications/PLAN/DM/0056/20/FUL>

Waltham Parish Council recommends refusal of this application on grounds that the increase to 82 dwellings will have a detrimental effect on the village infrastructure. The Local Plan refers to 66 properties, and since the Local Plan was adopted, further developments within the village have been approved. Whilst the development is within the boundary of the Parish of Barnoldby le Beck, in effect the residents will be using Waltham facilities.

Planning - IGE (ENGIE)

From: Chris
Sent: 23 October 2020 14:37
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: Planning Application Reference DM/0056/20/FUL

For the attention of Mr. Richard Limmer

I wish to register my objection to the above Planning Application. As before, my reasons are:-

1. Health and Safety will be compromised by extra traffic using Bradley Road.
2. Probable over-crowding in schools.
3. I feel Waltham village rather than Barnoldby-le-Beck will suffer if this development goes ahead.

Chris Mackrill,
14 Bradley Road,
Waltham.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Carol Pedersen (Engie)

From: Joan
Sent: 29 October 2020 15:36
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: DM/0056/20/FUL | Erect 82 dwellings to include garages, access roads and landscaping (amended site layout plans including zebra crossing, boundary treatments and plot repositions - Sept 2020) | Land At Bradley Road Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshir
Attachments: Planning objection October 2020.doc

Good afternoon

Please find attached our comments on the amended plans for planning application DM/0056/20/FUL

Kind Regards
Joan and Rod Sargent,
60 Bradley Road,
Waltham
DN37 0UZ

Having examined this new set of amended plans, my husband and I continue to object to the proposed development.

Our previous objections, outlined in July 2020 still stand –

- Safety concerns with extra traffic on an already busy road (made narrower now that traffic is not allowed to park on the verges); potential problems caused by the bend in the road close to the main entrance to the proposed development; and the potential for increased movements by traffic from the development exacerbating delays at peak hours on High Street in the village.
- Infrastructure concerns, already at risk because of the large-scale developments on Cheapside and Brigsley Road – school accommodation, parking in the village centre, lack of GP in the village.
- Concerns for the wildlife currently taking advantage of the grassland.
- Destruction of valuable green space which has been proven to aid mental health. If houses are urgently required, why are we not developing more of the brownfield sites within the town's boundary?
- Level of nuisance and disturbance, during and after the building work, with the main entrance to the site being almost opposite our bungalow

In addition, we note that the amended plan includes a bin area almost directly opposite our bungalow. We are concerned that an accumulation of bins in one place will not only look very unsightly, but will become an attraction for vermin.

ITEM 1 - DM/0056/20/FUL - BRADLEY ROAD, BARNOLDBY LE BECK

Carol Pedersen (Engie)

From: Graeme Clifton
Sent: 26 October 2020 10:26
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: Planning Application DM/0056/20/FUL

Dear Sir,

Proposal: Erect 82 Dwellings on Land at Bradley Road, Barnoldby Le Beck, North East Lincolnshire (Sept 2020)

I have attempted to access the planning website on a number of occasions and the site shows an 'ERROR' such that access is denied.

This Email is an addendum to my previous objection to this planning application. My previous objections were registered via your website and the immediate objection which jumps to mind involves the additional traffic, caused by this new development, along Bradley Road. Bradley Road is no more than a country lane with very high vehicle density already at peak periods. I note that a traffic survey has already been undertaken to assess the impact of the additional traffic. For a traffic survey to capture the true nature of the safety concerns, the survey needs to include a thorough review of the peak commuter traffic flow, in summer, when it includes; farm vehicles, cyclists, heavy goods vehicles and walkers on the road. Hence for the survey to be of real value it needs to include an 'on site' visual assessment of the current traffic status over a reasonable period of time.

There have been a number of quite serious accidents on this road notably on the acute bends. During the height of harvest season there is intense farm traffic along the road. On road vehicle parking already restricts traffic flow at the Waltham end. Heavy and Light Goods vehicles regularly use the road as a route to the M180 - these particular vehicles exacerbate the traffic flow restrictions throughout the length of the road. I personally find it unsafe to cycle along this road at peak periods.

I believe that a significant widening of Bradley Road, throughout its length, is needed to support the new development and therefore make it safe for all road users.

I hope I will be given the opportunity to review the plans in greater detail once the north east lincs website faults are repaired.

Regards

Graeme Clifton
6 Willow Park

ITEM 1 - DM/0506/20/FUL - BRADLEY ROAD, BARNOLDBY LE BECK

Angela Tynan (Engie)

From: Graeme Clifton
Sent: 28 October 2020 16:45
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: Planning Application DM/0056/20/FUL - Land at Bradley Road Barnoldby Le Beck

Dear Sir,

The Northern Transport Planning report dated September 2019 concludes " On-site observations and assessment of the operation of the local highway network have revealed no existing issues relating to highway capacity or safety – the local highway network operates satisfactorily."

Given that many of the objections received, from long standing local residents, identify safety and congestion concerns engendered by this new development on Bradley Road. I would like to see another independent Transport Planning assessment undertaken. I believe that North East Lincs planning department should share the 'terms of reference' for this assessment thus demonstrating its independence,

Regards
Graeme Clifton
6 Willow Park
Barnoldby Le Beck

ITEM 1 - DM/0056/20/FUL - BRADLEY ROAD, BARNOLDBY LE BECK



MRS. L. MELTON,
2/0 20 BARNOLDBY RD
WALTHAM.
DN37 0SP.

20TH OCT. 2020

Ref: DM/0056/20/FUL

I FEEL WE HAVE GIVEN TOO
MUCH GOOD AGRICULTURAL
LAND FOR HOUSING NOW.

HOUSES BUILT ARE UP MARKET
AND NOT AFFORDABLE TO
FIRST TIME BUYERS.

FOR EVERY ONE BUILT IT PUTS
2 CARS MORE ON OUR ROADS.

2/

BARNOLDBY ROAD NOW IS
A MAIN ARTERY AND GETTING
OUT OF OUR DRIVES TO JOIN
IS TAKING LONGER AND
LONGER.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH,
NO MORE.

YOURS,

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING AGENDA – 4TH NOVEMBER 2020

ITEM 2 – DM/0506/20/FUL – DAISY DENE, DEATON LANE, NEW WALTHAM

ADDITIONAL INFORMATIVE:

The applicant should note that this planning permission is for a new fence only and not an extension to the existing fence, to be installed as detailed on the approved plan.

ITEM 3 - DM/0265/20/REM - 59 CHEAPSIDE, WALTHAM

Planning Application DM/0265/20/REM – 59 Cheapside

I wish to comment on the Drainage Consultation Response 19th. October 2020.

Surface water drainage plans have not altered with this proposal of three bungalows because they are the same three dwellings proposed in DM/0735/17/FUL and DM/0759/19/FUL; minus rooms in the roof.

Surface Water

I challenge Drainage to explain why a small development of three dwellings needs to discharge surface water into the beck at all. Infiltration tanks alone on this site should be able to infiltrate water from the roofs and access road without the need to discharge via a pipe into the watercourse, whether at Greenfield rates or not.

The infiltration tank and ground conditions will not allow percolation through the soil at actual Greenfield rates as it does now, so surface drainage must discharge to the beck. Why has there been no other mitigation designed into this development to reduce the volume of surface water before it reaches the infiltration tank? There are design options open to achieve this.

No account is taken of the increasing frequency of high water flows since 2007.

Before 2007 this stretch of beck had never risen to the level that caused the flooding of our properties. Since that time it rises to high levels in periods of wet weather, even after moderate rainfall. The winter of 2019/20 was no exception. Residents have submitted photographs of the beck here showing water level with the top of the bank; by no means a 1:100 year event that Sustainable Drainage Systems are supposed to take in their stride.

What has changed since 2007 is the climate and an increase in the number of homes built in Waltham. Where is data on how the beck is coping with all this increase? The beck's capacity is finite.

Greenfield rates calculated for SUDs gives at best an approximation of the actual drainage rates. My objection to discharge into the beck is **not** that the flow from this development will increase the risk of flooding. I object to the discharge of surface water into the beck that is under stress during periods of heavy rainfall and where no one seems to have a clear overall picture of what is happening to it.

The system has to work in high water flows. How can it if the headwall is underwater?

Buck Beck

Drainage says that the 6m gap distance from the beck is arbitrary and does not relate to the potential impacts on structural integrity, but is to facilitate maintenance. Drainage comments in DM/0759/19/FUL "the

design of the foundations of the proposed dwellings should also be considered" would indicate that type and depth of foundations for the dwellings **do** relate to proximity to the bank.

The comparison with Mount Pleasant is not particularly valid as the two sites are different and do not have the same problems attached to construction.

The documents do not answer these points for residents: -

1. The actual construction should be within the strict parameters of the documentation.
2. What is happening to the rest of the bank of Plot 1? Will the short section after the reinforcement be re-profiled and pushed forward? The four remaining trees may be removed after all. If their roots are excavated, will this short section be covered by erosion blanket until new roots establish?
3. How deep will the foundations need to be for the dwelling on Plot 1 in the unstable geology here considering how close it is to the reinforcement?
4. What exactly is to happen to the rest of this dynamic bank, now and into the future?

(A document, RD 3962 -02 K, submitted for the appeal of DM/0759/19/FUL suggests that some of the trees currently shown on the possibly redundant RD: 3962-17 Proposed Site Plan (Alternative), would be removed if this proposal is accepted. It raises the question of bank instability in the 2017 application that led to bank having to be reinforced. Will the reinforced section need extending?)

Conclusion

The proposal may well present a SUDs compliant surface water drainage scheme if it were sitting alongside any other watercourse. It takes no account of other factors affecting Buck Beck. Other residents who live alongside the beck elsewhere in the village are also feeling the effects of the increase in the number of high water levels.

The proposed drainage system is unacceptable. The practice of allowing discharge is short-sighted in this the main drainage channel of Waltham.

The documents referred to in the drainage comment do not answer the other concerns I have listed.

The proposed dwellings are too large for this site so consequently cannot avoid the complications proximity to the bank brings. The smaller bungalows originally proposed in DM/0735/17/OUT; allow a greater distance from the bank for all dwellings.

Aspects of this bank reinforcement leave the detail to planning conditions. Residents have to put their trust in a developer, some of whose actions have shown a lack of respect to the planning process and health and safety; resulting in Breach of Condition notices. I do not believe that planning conditions would be an effective control.

Frequent high water levels have a bearing on the bank; it is these flows that will find weaknesses and not the day to day low levels usually seen in Buck Beck.

Doubts remain that this proposal is in accordance with Policies 5 and 33 of the NELLP and I respectfully request the application be refused.

Stephen Boyd

8 Cheesemans Close

Carol Pedersen (Engie)

To: Lauren Birkwood (Engie)
Subject: RE: Planning - 16 Radcliffe Road, Healing - DM/0461/20/FUL

From: Richard Dixon
Sent: 23 October 2020 15:12
To: Lauren Birkwood (Engie) <Lauren.Birkwood@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning - 16 Radcliffe Road, Healing - DM/0461/20/FUL

Hi Lauren,

Further to the latest letter of objection from the parish council that stated that they maintain their 2 objections, being on the grounds of concern regarding drainage (which they do not clarify or identify) and regarding concern in respect of the impact upon neighbours amenity, we would respond as follows:

DRAINAGE

It is acknowledged that No 4 and No 6 Radcliffe Road have had a historic drainage and flooding issue in the past. This is not too surprising as they are in a dip at the bottom of the hill. However, the applicant has already spoken with the owner of No 6 Radcliffe Road and assured him, that if he ever makes a further planning application for the previously proposed and approved residential development of the site by the addition of two more dwellings, then he would include additional drainage provisions within that application to try and help alleviate his existing problem by ensuring rain water from his proposed buildings and hard surfaces will be discharged to the public sewer or other approved sustainable drainage system to be agreed as required.

Further my client has agreed to restrict these two new dwellings to one and a half storey's in height, subject to Council approval, in order to try any be helpful to the owners of No 6 and No 4, who wish to see such a design.

However, the current roof area of the existing building is fully drained to the mains surface water drainage system and has no impact upon anyone else's land. The bungalow and it's roof water drainage has nothing to do with the existing water issues in the back gardens of No 4 and No 6, and the new roof proposed is no greater in area, than the existing roof area and therefore the current planning application has no drainage implications on any neighbours.

We understand that the Council's own internal consultations have raised no objections from their drainage, highways, public protection and trees and landscape sections and indeed no planning conditions in this regard have been recommended. We also understand that following the submission of revised plans addressing concerns of the planning officer these have now resolved matters such that the application will be recommended for approval.

IMPACT UPON AMENITY

Loss of amenity had originally been quoted as a reason for concern by 5 of the 16 neighbours based on the original submission. These concerns were reviewed and a revised and reduced scheme was then put forward to address these matters. In addition, additional cross sections and level plans have also been produced following a further site meeting with the planning officer (two months ago) to help explain the levels etc.

The applicant has taken the time to look at all other options including the possibility of building single storey extensions and/or rooms in the existing roof with dormers, but has been unable to attain a scheme that would prove to be sustainable. Indeed all of these alternative designs work out at 30-60% more expensive to gain the same floor space, and we agreed that these are actually no more favourable than the original scheme in terms of aesthetics.

We would like to clarify that the site is currently surrounded by 16 residential properties. Of these 9 are actually 2 storey dwellings, a further 5 are one & a half storey and only 2 are actually bungalows. Any suggestion that bungalows predominate in this area is simply not true.

Within the revised scheme we have tried very hard to address the issues raised by objectors.

This includes the overall size of the original proposals and the massing. In respect of which we have made a number of reductions to that scheme as shown on the revised plans which have resulted in the ridge line being lowered by over 1000mm, the reduction in the side wing by 1500mm, and the removal of the proposed gable end and replaced this with a hip roof, reducing this area by 3000mm. We consider the reduced massing to be acceptable.

We would point out that the proposal is over 15m and 50m, away from the one and a half storey dwelling at 12A The Avenue and the two storey dwelling at 14 The Avenue. The single small side facing window on the west elevation has now been obscure glazed to remove any overlooking to this side and we note that these two neighbours have not objected further to the revised scheme. By comparison we must point out that the new dwelling at 12A The Avenue, that has only recently been completed was approved and built with 4 new windows within 1m and clearly shown overlooking the applicant's garden.

On the opposite side elevation the scheme only ever indicated obscure glazed bathroom windows, and indeed the neighbour at 14 Radcliffe Road, who has previously made similar changes to his bungalow to create a two storey dwelling and being only 8m from the applicant's building, did not raise any objection to these windows. We would also point out that this previous planning approval, that is considerably closer to the applicant's land, dwelling and windows, does also set a precedent for the current proposals.

No objections were received from any neighbours to the rear.

The revised scheme now includes just one new bedroom window facing the rear gardens of the properties on Radcliffe Road. This window is marginally short of 12m away from this boundary at its very closest point and more than 12m away for the vast majority of the whole boundary with No 6. Indeed it is over 20m away from all other boundaries to properties on Radcliffe Road, and it is nationally accepted that a separation distance of 12m is acceptable in such a location.

The possibility of overlooking is suggested by objectors, in some cases over huge distances, but overlooking must result in unacceptable harm and such harm does not exist in this case. To support this claim we would look to the previous planning approval for next door at No 14. We would also point out that the owners of No 6, in 2015 carried out a loft conversion to make their bungalow into a one and a half storey dwelling. They installed 2 rear facing roof lights and a side gable window all in clear glazing, all of which overlook the applicant's garden. The applicant has no objection to these "overlooking" windows and we do not consider that they present substantial harm to the applicant's amenity. Further we would suggest that owners of No 6, would not have installed these windows had they considered that these would have caused harm to any neighbour and on this note we would ask you to consider the scheme to be acceptable and approve the current scheme.

We would appreciate it if this email could be shared with the Healing Parish Council and Councillor David Hasthorpe and indeed if possible all planning committee Councillors prior to the meeting.

Richard Dixon FRICS C.BuildE FCABE

Richard Dixon Associates Ltd
Chartered Surveyors & Architectural Services

14 High Street
Bridlington
YO16 4PX

Office No. 01262 603 501



Ministry of Defence

Richard Limmer
North East Lincolnshire Planning
New Oxford House
George Street
Grimsby
North East Lincolnshire
DN31 1HB

Your reference: DM/1145/19/FUL

Our reference: DIO 10047224

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Safeguarding Department
Statutory & Offshore

Defence Infrastructure Organisation
Kingston Road
Sutton Coldfield
West Midlands
B75 7RL

Tel: 07970170926

Fax: +44 (0)121 311 2218

E-mail: DIO-safeguarding-statutory@mod.gov.uk

www.mod.uk/DIO

28 October 2020

Dear Richard

MOD Safeguarding – SITE OUTSIDE SAFEGUARDING AREA (SOSA)

Proposal: Construction and operation of an energy park comprising photovoltaic (PV) solar panels together with energy (battery) storage and associated infrastructure

Location: Land At Mauxhall Farm Immingham Road Stallingborough Grimsby

Grid Ref: 519,288 413,436

Thank you for consulting Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) on the above proposed development. This application relates to a site outside of Ministry of Defence safeguarding areas.

We can therefore confirm that the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

I trust this is clear however should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Kalie Jagpal
Assistant Safeguarding Manager

Planning - IGE (ENGIE)

From: Richard Wright <richard.wright@witham3idb.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 October 2020 15:48
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Subject: FW: Planning Consultation Ref: DM/1145/19/FUL
Attachments: ufm63.pdf

ND-5034-2020-PLN

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application Reference: DM/1145/19/FUL - Amended Plans
Proposal: Construction and operation of an energy park comprising photovoltaic (PV) solar panels together with energy (battery) storage and associated infrastructure
Location: Land At Mauxhall Farm Immingham Road Stallingborough Grimsby

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the **above amended plans**. The site is within the North East Lindsey Drainage Board area.

Having reviewed the amendments the Board has no further comments to make over-and-above our previous comments submitted on the 24th January 2020 (below):-

*The Board's maintained **8A – Immingham Pump Drain** runs along the north east boundary of the site.*

Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act. 1991 the prior written consent of the Board is required for any proposed temporary or permanent works or structures within any watercourse including infilling or a diversion. Also, the prior written consent of the Board is required for the introduction of any water into the District whether directly or indirectly.

*A permanent undeveloped strip of sufficient width should be made available adjacent to the top of the bank of all watercourses on site to allow future maintenance works to be undertaken. Suitable access arrangements to this strip should also be agreed with the Drainage Team at Local Planning Authority. Board maintained watercourses, as **8A Immingham Pump Drain**, will require suitable and continuous access for maintenance with our tracked machines, and are subject to the Board's Byelaws (10).*

10) No Obstruction within 7 Metres of the Edge of the Watercourse No person without the previous consent of the Board shall erect any building or structure whether temporary or permanent, or plant any tree, shrub, willow or other similar growth within 7 metres of the landward toe of the bank where there is an embankment or wall or within 7 metres of the top of the batter where there is no embankment or wall, or where the watercourse is enclosed within 7 metres of the enclosing structure.

Regards,

Richard Wright

Engineering Services Technician

Witham First District Internal Drainage Board
Witham Third District Internal Drainage Board
Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board
North East Lindsey Drainage Board

IMPORTANT NOTICE. Due to COVID-19 the Office is currently operating with a reducing staffing level and is closed, for all enquires please telephone the office number or email enquiries@witham3idb.gov.uk. We will endeavour to respond as soon as practical.

****We have moved. Please note our new address is****

Witham House,
Meadow Lane
North Hykeham,
LINCOLN,
LN6 9QU (for sat nav use LN6 9TP)
Tel: 01522 697123

Four independent statutory Land Drainage and Flood Risk Management Authorities working in partnership.

www.northeastlindsey-idb.org.uk
www.witham3idb.gov.uk
www.upperwitham-idb.gov.uk
www.witham-1st-idb.gov.uk

***** Disclaimer**** The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. Any correspondence with the sender will be subject to automatic monitoring. Please note that neither the Board or the sender accept any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan attachments (if any).*

-----Original Message-----

From: planning@nelincs.gov.uk <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 October 2020 10:07
To: Planning and Consents <planning@witham3idb.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Consultation Ref: DM/1145/19/FUL

Dear Sir/Madam
Please see attached letter.

Reduce your environmental footprint, please do not print this email unless you really need to.

North Lincolnshire Council, North East Lincolnshire Council and Northern Lincolnshire Business Connect This e-mail and any files transmitted with it contains information from North East Lincolnshire Council, North Lincolnshire Council or Northern Lincolnshire Business Connect which may be privileged or confidential. The information is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient be aware that any processing of this email and its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please send it back to us, immediately and permanently delete it. Do not use, copy or disclose the information contained in this message or in any attachment. The North East Lincolnshire Council, North Lincolnshire Council or Northern Lincolnshire Business Connect email system, including emails and their content, may be monitored for security reasons and to ensure compliance with council policy. Emails and attachments may be recorded for the effective operation of the organisation and for other lawful business purposes. We cannot guarantee that this email or its attachments are virus free or has not been intercepted and amended. We therefore recommend you carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any email or attachments. North East Lincolnshire Council, North Lincolnshire Council or Northern Lincolnshire Business Connect will not accept any liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this email or its attachments, or any damage or loss caused by computer viruses coming from this email or its attachments.

STATEMENT DISCLAIMER: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Therefore, if the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is strictly

prohibited. If they have come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone; please reply to this e-mail and highlight the error. Any views or opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of Witham and Humber Drainage Boards unless otherwise explicitly stated. Whilst the Board does run anti-virus software, you are solely responsible for ensuring that any e-mail or attachment you receive is virus free and Witham and Humber Drainage Board disclaims any liability for any damage suffered as a consequence of receiving any virus. Witham and Humber Drainage Boards take your privacy seriously and only use your personal information to administer your account and to provide the products and services you have requested from us. The processing of personal data is governed by legislation relating to personal data which applies in the United Kingdom including the General Data Protection Regulation (the "GDPR") and other legislation relating to personal data and rights such as the Human Rights Act. Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail

Carol Pedersen (Engie)

From: Planning - IGE (ENGIE)
Sent: 02 November 2020 10:54
To: Carol Pedersen (Engie)
Subject: FW: DM/0056/20/FUL Bradley Road Barnoldby Le Beck Plans

-----Original Message-----

From: Dawn Tuxworth
Sent: 31 October 2020 21:57
To: Planning - IGE (ENGIE) <planning@nelincs.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/0056/20/FUL Bradley Road Barnoldby Le Beck Plans

I am lodging my objections yet again to the proposed 82 dwelling proposal on the land at the above address. I have lodged my objections 4 times now and the reasons all still apply, more so since the number of proposed dwellings has grown from 66 to 82!

I sincerely hope all previous objections are taken into account as they all still apply.

Why swallow up more green belt, prime farming land when there are hundreds of empty properties in Grimsby town centre which could easily be renovated, improving the town centre at the same time as providing in town accommodation for families who would prefer town centre living to an out of town residence.

The B road running between my house and the proposed development is not good enough for the volume of traffic it gets now, never mind the increase of nearly 200 vehicles the new development will generate. It is like a racetrack, vehicles do not adhere to the 30mph speed limit coming off the 40mph limit often travelling at speeds in excess of 60mph! It is a very dangerous road.

There are no available school places in Waltham, No GP practice, a fully subscribed dentist and very little parking which is always full around the shops in the village centre.

The view from my house is spectacular, I know its not considered but this is one of the reasons I purchased the house I'm in. Unimportant to those who decide and don't live in the area.

It's time for the powers that be to make the right decision and deny this development permission to ruin what is a lovely village at the moment, the massive developments nearby in New Waltham and Brigsley will cause major traffic congestion in the area without adding to that. The infrastructure is just not there, we do not have enough access roads into and out of town and permission to develop this land into unrequired housing.

Dawn Tuxworth,
74, Bradley Road,
Waltham,
Grimsby,
DN37 0XQ