

## Application Number: PA/2011/0983

(please quote in all correspondence)

**Case Officer:** Mark Simmonds Tel: 01724 297309

**email:** [planning@northlincs.gov.uk](mailto:planning@northlincs.gov.uk)

17 August 2011

Mr J Whittaker  
John Whittaker Architects  
4 Barrow Road  
BARTON UPON HUMBER  
DN18 6AA

Dear Sir/Madam

### TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 NOTIFICATION OF RECEIPT OF A FULL PLANNING APPLICATION

**Proposal:** Planning permission to demolish existing dwelling and outbuildings and erect a new dwelling

**Site Location:** Hillcrest Back Street Alkborough

**Applicant:** Mr V Dransfield

Your application was received as valid on 12/08/2011. A decision should be reached by 07/10/2011. Any enquiries should be made to the case officer. Please be aware that the application form, plus any accompanying drawings and most documents will be made publicly available on the Council's web site. You can also check the progress of your application on the web site and view/download digital copies of most documents. Your application, fees and drawings can now be submitted online using the Planning Portal. Further information about this service is available on the Council's web site [www.northlincs.gov.uk](http://www.northlincs.gov.uk)

We decide most applications within the time allowed and we will try to make sure you receive a decision before the due date. This will not be possible in every case, however.

Most applications are decided by myself without reference to the Planning Committee under a clearly defined scheme of delegation. Major or controversial plans will be decided by the Planning Committee. **If you want to put your views to the Committee yourself, or have someone do this for you please write to me within 21 days of the date of this letter.** If you do write, I will let you know the date of the meeting when the application will be considered - it is not possible to say this now.

If, by the 07/10/2011, we have not given you a decision in writing or you have not agreed to extend the decision period, then you may appeal to the Department for Communities and Local Government. You must make your appeal within six months from that date. You must use a form which you can either get from the Planning Inspectorate at Room 304A Kite Wing, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN, or you can make your appeal on line and track its progress using the Planning Portal. More information can be found on [www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/pcs).

Yours faithfully

**Marcus Walker**  
**Head**

of

**Regeneration**

&

**Planning**

# NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL

## NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF A PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### THE SITE IS WITHIN THE CONSERVATION AREA

#### PLANNING APPLICATION NO. PA/2011/0983 & PA/2011/0987

The Council has received the following proposals:

**Planning permission to demolish existing dwelling and outbuildings and erect a new dwelling and conservation area consent to demolish house and out buildings**

**Location:**

**Hillcrest Back Street Alkborough**

The applications and submitted plans may be seen in the Development Control office at Pittwood House, Ashby Road, Scunthorpe between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm Monday to Thursday (inclusive) and 4:30 on Friday. It can also be viewed on line at [www.northlincs.gov.uk](http://www.northlincs.gov.uk). Alternatively, you may find it more convenient to arrange to inspect the copy of the applications (during reasonable hours Monday to Friday) which has been supplied to Mrs J M Hindness, Clerk to Alkborough Parish Council, Hunters Moon, Whitton Road, Alkborough, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire DN15 9JG. Please telephone to arrange a prior appointment on 01724 720484.

If you wish to express any views about the proposals you should do so by writing to the Development Control Team at North Lincolnshire Council, Pittwood House, Ashby Road, Scunthorpe, DN16 1AB, quoting the application reference number stated above.

**Householder Development\*\*** If the application relates to householder development, in the event that an appeal is made against a decision of the Council to refuse to grant planning permission for the proposed development, and that appeal then proceeds by way of the expedited procedure under the written representations procedure, any representations made to the Council about the application will be passed to the Secretary of State and **there will be no opportunity to make further representations.**

If you do write, please bear in mind that anyone may read your letter, either before or after the application is determined or later if there is an appeal against the council's decision. A copy of your letter will also appear on the council's web site [www.northlincs.gov.uk](http://www.northlincs.gov.uk). We will consider all relevant comments although we cannot enter into detailed correspondence.

Written representations received by the council on or before will be considered before the application is determined.

\*\* Householder development means development of an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. It does not include a change of use or a change to the number of dwellings in a building.

**Marcus Walker**  
**Head of Regeneration & Planning**

**From:** Mark Simmonds/PL/NorthLincs  
**To:** mail@dieternelson.com  
**cc:** Planning/PL/NorthLincs@NorthLincs

**Date:** 23 August, 2011 10:18AM  
**Subject:** Re: PA/2011/0983

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SECTION	
23 AUG 2011	
DATE RECEIVED	
Referred To	

Hi Dieter,

I hope you are well.

With regards to the certificate, unless the development site specifically incorporates land under your clients ownership then Certificate A is correct. The Party Wall Act would be likely to address any issues with the boundary, the Party Wall Act is not a planning issue as such, but Building Control 01724 297411, may be able to advise further.

Regards,

Mark Simmonds  
 North Lincolnshire Council

-----"Dieter" <mail@dieternelson.com> wrote: -----

To: <mark.simmonds@northlincs.gov.uk>  
 From: "Dieter" <mail@dieternelson.com>  
 Date: 23/08/2011 09:52AM  
 Subject: PA/2011/0983 - Planning permission to demolish existing dwelling and outbuildings and erect a new dwelling, Hillcrest, Back Street, Alkborough, DN15 9JN

Hi Mark,

I hope you are well?

With regard to the above application my client has asked me to review the application details. One initial issue raised, on a technicality, appears to be that Certificate A only has been signed. I consider that the planning application may be invalid. As the development is on the boundary, I would have thought that Certificate B would have needed to be served on my client. This would be consistent with the recent application applied for relating to the retrospective garage, on my clients site, at Ricoster.

With regard to the specific merits of the proposal, I will send a further email, once I have received a response from you on the technical issue raised above.

I look forward to your response, at your earliest convenience.

Regards

Dieter Nelson Dip (URP)  
 Director

Dieter Nelson Planning Consultancy Ltd  
 Unit 12, Cleethorpes Business Centre  
 Jackson Place  
 Wilton Road Industrial Estate  
 Humberston  
 Grimsby  
 NE Lincs

**From:** "Dieter" <mail@dieternelson.com>  
**To:** <mark.simmonds@northlincs.gov.uk>  
**cc:** <planning@northlincs.gov.uk>

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SECTION	
30 AUG 2011	
DATE RECEIVED	
Referred To	MBS

**Date:** 29 August, 2011 02:33PM

**Subject:** PA/2011/0987 & PA/2011/0983 - demolish existing dwelling and outbuildings and erect a new dwelling, Hillcrest, Back Street, Alkborough, DN15 9JN

Dear Mark,

**OBJECTION TO PLANNING / CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT APPLICATIONS**

I refer to the above mentioned planning / conservation applications which you are currently considering and I wish to raise the following objections on behalf of my client, Mr T Coulson, Ricoster, Back Street. The application property is located within a prominent position within the Alkborough Conservation Area, as viewed from the public realm. The building does have architectural and historic merit due to its simple design / scale. There appears to be no assessment submitted, in line with PPS5, to justify its demolition. The loss of this property will have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which is in direct conflict with both National and Local Planning Policies.

It appears, from the submitted photographs, that the works already undertaken to the building, through the demolition works and the removal of internal features within the main property has undermined the structural integrity of the existing property. This could have been negated if a structural survey had been undertaken prior to the commencement of works. The survey would have influenced the order in which the works were undertaken, rather than an ad hoc approach which appears to have happened.

It is requested that planning and conservation area consent are refused as sufficient justification has not been submitted to support the applications.

I would also like to highlight the issues of objection raised in my previous email dated 16/10/2010, as detailed below. Whilst it is acknowledged that the current proposal relates to a new build rather than extensions to the parent property the issues below are still fundamental as my clients residential amenity will be materially harmed.

Having reviewed the submitted details on the website, and after a further site visit on the 14 October 2010, please accept this email as a formal objection, on behalf of my client.

It is considered that the revisions made to the scheme do not adequately address the previous issues and concerns highlighted in the previous objection submitted under planning application PA/2010/0751.

The sprawling nature of the extensions have not been reduced or re-designed in such a way that it reduces / mitigates the detrimental impact created upon my client's property, in particular the

area adjacent to my client's kitchen and conservatory.

The proposal still facilitates extensive extensions to the existing modest sized property. The cumulative scale of the extensions is an over intensive development of the site and does not enhance the Conservation Area.

My client's property is located to the north of the application site. There are a number of existing side windows at Ricoster, in very close proximity to the boundary, adjacent to the proposed development.

The specific issues of concern relate to loss of outlook, massing impact and sprawl. The revised scheme is in conflict with the Development Plan and should be refused.

As previously stated, under planning application PA/2010/0751, there is a low boundary wall between Ricoster and the application site. My client has an existing side kitchen and lounge window which currently benefit from natural daylight for a significant proportion of the day. These windows are only located some 1.5 - 1.7 m from the boundary.

The proposal facilitates the provision of a solid brick and pantile extension, facing my client's property. The proposal will create a detrimental impact in terms of outlook and massing impact upon the kitchen and lounge window, of my client's property. The location of the extension is also likely to seriously restrict natural daylight into the kitchen area due to the sun path (from east to west), especially during the winter months when the sun is much lower in the sky.

My client's property has also benefitted from a rear conservatory, which is located 1.1 m from the boundary, at the nearest point, adjacent to an existing low single storey building on the application site. The provision of a two storey building, to the south of my client's conservatory, will materially impact to the detriment of my client in terms of loss of light and massing impact.

Outlook from the rear of my client's garden will also be harmed due to the scale, mass and sprawling nature of the extensions.

The information contained within the DAS is also misleading as reference is made to the historic structures on the application site. My client has informed me that the shed was only a modest size structure and the trellis was also at a low level which maintained a satisfactory outlook from the kitchen and lounge window of Ricoster.

One further issue which should be raised, even though it is not a specific planning issue, relates to the fact that the extension is proposed to be built adjacent to the boundary. Therefore it is likely that the Party Wall Act will be relevant in this case. Any construction works requiring access from my client's property will require the formal written agreement of my client i.e. for the erection of scaffolding etc. Based on the current scheme it is unlikely that this consent will be obtained due to the detrimental impact being caused upon my client's residential amenity through the development proposal.

Please acknowledge safe receipt of this objection and any further correspondence should be forwarded directly to myself.

If you wish to discuss any element contained within this email, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Dieter Nelson Dip (URP)  
Director

Dieter Nelson Planning Consultancy Ltd  
Unit 12, Cleethorpes Business Centre  
Jackson Place  
Wilton Road Industrial Estate  
Humberston  
Grimsby  
NE Lincs  
DN36 4AS

Mob: 07875750031

[www.dieternelson.com](http://www.dieternelson.com)

Registered Number 6381825 Registered in England and Wales

-----  
Reduce your environmental footprint, please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

The information in this message including any attachments may be confidential or privileged and is for the use of the named recipient only. If you are not the named or intended recipient you may not copy, distribute, or deliver this message to anyone or take any action in reliance on it. If you receive this message in error please contact the sender immediately and delete it from your system

Attachments:

042.JPG



**From:** Mark Simmonds/PL/NorthLincs  
**To:** Planning/PL/NorthLincs@NorthLincs

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SECTION	
15 SEP 2011	
Referred To	DATE RECEIVED

**Date:** 15 September, 2011 11:05AM

**Subject:** Fw: 2011/983 & 987 - Hillcrest, Back Street, Alkborough

-----Forwarded by Mark Simmonds/PL/NorthLincs on 15/09/2011 11:05AM -----

To: <mark.simmonds@northlincs.gov.uk>  
 From: "John Whittaker" <john@whittaker.org.uk>  
 Date: 15/09/2011 11:01AM  
 Cc: "barbara dransfield" <[REDACTED]>  
 Subject: 2011/983 & 987 - Hillcrest, Back Street, Alkborough

Mark

With regard to the above, and for the record, I would like to comment on the objections sent in by Dieter Nelson Planning Consultancy Ltd on behalf of my clients neighbour, Mr T Coulson of Ricoster, Back St, Alkborough.

The existing consent previously granted for this site allows for the demolition of the outbuildings to the front and rear and for their rebuilding in accordance with the approved scheme along with all the works proposed to the original house. Because of the nature of the masonry exposed and the reports from Simpkins Kenny, Structural Engineers, it was agreed with Eddie Rychlak that the gable walls could be demolished and rebuilt (ERs email 04/05/11). Technically therefore these present applications are only seeking to rebuild the long side walls as all of the other works already have consent.

On the specifics of the objection I would respond as follows;

The Planning Statement details the background to the present situation and all of the relevant financial matters which provides the justification for the demolition and rebuild.

The proposal cannot have a detrimental impact as suggested as it is not lost, it is simply rebuilt with exactly the same appearance as before using stone and bricks reclaimed from the demolished structure. The fact that the large rendered panel on Mr Coulsons side where another building had once been attached can only be an improvement.

Amongst other matters Mr Coulson wrote to Ron White (23/07/10) on the previous application that "I agree that the development is an improvement and in keeping" which seems at variance with the points made by his agent.

All of the objections raised this time are the same as last time which, where considered necessary, have been addressed.

The proposal meets all the requirements of NLCs SPGs and more.

Mr Coulson and his agent refuse to concede that sunlight arrives at an angle down from the sky but that it seems to travel horizontally across the surface of the earth (note the angle requirement on the SPG). There will be no loss of light into any part of the premises. As I recall, Mr Coulsons Kitchen is behind the Conservatory which had had the translucent roof under boarded with plasterboard. This is why it is dark in his house.

The gross area of the demolitions at ground level, not including the house is about 52sq.m and the new build not including the house is about 73 sq.m ie an increase of 21sq.m. Hardly extensive or the scale,

mass and sprawling nature referred to. Also the site area at ground level is about 340sq.m and the completed house would be about 118sq.m thus representing about 35% (28.5% presently) and well below the 50% coverage limit. Hardly over development.

With regard to the historic structures referred to the DAS these are as described by my client. Clearly this is a matter of interpretation by the two parties.

John Whitaker