

PLANNING APPLICATION PA/2018/814 DUKE WILLIAM - COMMENTS ON AMENDED PLAN

[REDACTED]

Wed 03/10/2018 21:38

To: Planning <Planning@northlincs.gov.uk>;

The We Live Here Haxey Group would make the following comments on the revised plans that have been submitted in relation to the above application:

Although the revised plans attempt to address a number of concerns and objections we raised we remain steadfast in our opinion that the planning application should be refused on planning grounds. Our objections remain the same but we would comment specifically on the revised plans as follows:

- Although a turning area has been incorporated at the rear of the development site it is doubtful that this will be sufficient for a large vehicle such as the Refuse Collection Vehicle to manoeuvre and turnaround
- If the refuse vehicle has to reverse up into the site it has the additional hazard of reversing over a ramp and the reversing manoeuvre on Church Street will create a serious risk to other road users and pedestrians
- Unit No 7 is either drawn the wrong way round on the block plan so you cannot actually get into the garage from the driveway or the driveway is in the wrong location
- Units 5 and 6 are still located in close proximity to the northern boundary of the site, leaving no room for any decent landscaping barrier up to the path
- The ancient hedgerow is likely to be replaced by fence panels by the occupants of Unit 5 and 6 destroying the vista from the open countryside
- We would reiterate that units 5 and 6 are still sited in the LC14 Landscape Designation which is contrary to the saved policy as outlined in our previous objection.
- The house types are still bungalows with integrated garages, which are very likely to be converted to extra bedrooms at a future date, further leading to the over-development of the site.
- Generally, this is still a desperate attempt to cram as much poor development as possible on to what is a small site.
- The removal of the local facility will severely damage Haxey as a functioning settlement by removing a vital community facility. The non-viability of the Duke has not been sufficiently proven and re-use possibilities have not been explored.
- The new layout shows access to the new house (27A) with vehicular access to the rear of the site. The plan showing the elevations and floor plan show that the double garage access is on the side of the garage not the end of the building. A double drive to these garages would cause a hazard to traffic entering or leaving the development as they would be so close to the junction onto the site
- The plan for plot 27A shows the drive where the garage cannot be accessed by the occupants vehicles
- The largest property on the development (the public house) only has a single garage. This property is likely to attract occupants with more than 2 cars so would

impact on the development if vehicles park on the boundary creating a hazard at the development site entrance and parking on the ramp

- The additional car parking spaces on the original plan have now been removed – this potentially could have alleviated pressure for parking cars on the development site if the occupants have more than one vehicle. There is therefore likely to be even more pressure with on-street parking on Church Street.
- The floorplans for bungalows 1-5 and 7 show the bedrooms to be very tight for space. There is a strong likelihood that the occupants in the longer term will apply to convert the garage to create a larger bedroom. If this occurs and the bungalows become three bedroomed there is likely to be additional pressure to park cars.
- All our previous comments submitted for the first deadline for submission remain valid and we would wish that these considered alongside these additional comments.

Regards

Secretary

WE LIVE HERE-HAXEY

www.welivehere-haxe.org