

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/Y2003/W/25/3360396

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

Appeal By

Site Address

SENDER DETAILS

Name

Address

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Information re APPEAL APP/Y2003/W/25/3360396 - PA/2024/713 Cosgrove House

I made objections to the original planning application. The submitted appeal response documents have not addressed concerns I raised at that time. This information is in addition to the objection I submitted to the original planning application. The planning application for the building refers to the construction as an extension to the property. It is in fact a stand-alone building towards the end of the property boundary. Whilst the initial information suggested that there would be a 'warden' on site at all times, how this individual will monitor a separate building to ensure that only those supposed to be there are present there is not made clear. The development plans indicate that there will be access to this property via the ten-foot (assume this is to allow a fire exit) with a recessed gate from the ten-foot. How any warden would be able to monitor who was being given access to the development from the rear of the new development is moot.

Addressing comments made in the Appeal, whilst it is true that the rear of the property at number 37 Wells Street is block paved neither the owner of the property, number 33 – 35 Wells Street, nor the designer of the building have done more than seen the block paving and assume it is used only for parking. The statement fails to acknowledge that the property at number 37 is divided into two flats (upstairs and downstairs). With the upstairs flat having rear access via a fire escape which takes up a considerable area of the small courtyard garden to the rear of the property, significantly restricting outside space for the residents upstairs and downstairs. The residents of these properties have used the block paved area for recreational purposes, especially during summer months. As an example, recently during sunny early spring days they used that space on the weekend of the 8th and 9th March 2025, with residents of the ground floor flat sitting out on the paved area relaxing in the sun. Similarly on Tuesday 11th March at least one of the residents was sitting outside on the paved area enjoying a warm morning, during the sunny week we have been experiencing the area has been used for entertaining. This would not be possible if the proposed building was in situ as it would obscure the sun/cast a shadow over a large part of the area. The proposed development will also impact on the rear of the courtyard garden at number 39 Wells Street. Obstructing the sun for a considerable number of months. In the winter months when the sun is low the proposed building will completely restrict the sun to the whole of the rear of 37 and 39 Wells Street

With regard to the appeal information, much is made about the impact on number 37. It makes no reference to the impact on number 39 Wells Street. This property is a mirror image of number 37 Wells Street, with the difference being that it is still a house and has not blocked off any windows. The location of number 39 means that the rear of the property has windows facing the proposed development. In only referencing the impact on Number 37 the Appeal information has totally ignored the concerns raised by the residents of Number 39 in their response to the Planning Application. The view from the downstairs kitchen, sitting room French window, upstairs bathroom, main bedroom and rear bedroom windows of this property, number 39, will be significantly impacted as the new two storey building will obscure/impact the skyline. As will the view and sunlight into the garden of this property, number 39.

The proposed development is not in keeping with the boundary of any of the other properties on the street. The current development taking place at 31 Wells Street, the extension to the WEA building, has been sympathetically designed to blend with the two storey boundaries of all the other properties. The proposed development at Cosgrove House is totally different and alien to the rest of the properties. Overshadowing both land to the west and south. It will overshadow the Children's Centre and impact on light to side windows of that building.

The original application suggests that there is a lack of B&B/Hotel accommodation within the Town Centre and close to the railway and bus station. This is incorrect. There are a considerable number of B&B and Hotels within the town centre, with some closer to the railway station. The original plan submitted for this development included the extension of an outbuilding as well as the erection of the new building. The extension to the outbuilding has already taken place and the number '16' is affixed to the door of that new room. This would seem to indicate that there are now at least sixteen letting rooms in Cosgrove House.

Regarding mention of the tree which was under a TPO when removed in early November 2020. The owner of the property was informed that they had removed this illegally and has had more than sufficient time to plant a replacement. It appears that the sudden interest in rectifying this could be

seen as an attempt to paint the application in a more favourable light. It should be noted that the owner removed three trees from the site at that time, two of which had TPOs. Both were Lime trees (T.1 & T.2) on the North Lincolnshire Council TPO mapping.

The concerns about anti-social behaviour are outlined in the original information I submitted along with the concerns raised by the Police and local ward councillors. There is nothing in the Appeal which changes those concerns.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/Y2003/W/25/3360396

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/Y2003/W/25/3360396

Appeal By MR BHARAT SINGH

Site Address
Cosgrove Guest House
33-35 Wells Street
SCUNTHORPE
DN15 6HL

SENDER DETAILS

Name CLLR LORRAINE YEADON

Address
North Lincolnshire Council
Church Square House 30-40 High Street
SCUNTHORPE
DN15 6NL

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I as one of the elected Ward Councillors in Town Ward which includes Wells Street, fully support the refusal of the planning application by North Lincolnshire Council to erect extension to hotel to provide additional bedrooms over two storeys at Cosgrove Guest House, 33-35 Wells Street, Scunthorpe, DN15 6HL.

I agree with the refusal reasons stated.

In addition, I fully support the comments made by a local resident, C. Stephenson and by the Crime Reduction Officer, Humberside Police.

There is already considerable anti-social behaviour in the area adjacent to the hotel – this includes prostitution. This is already of particular concern to us because the activities often take place in daylight hours and also at school arrival and leaving times.

As the local primary school is very close to the 10 foot (alley) behind the hotel, it is used extensively by children going to and from school creating potential safeguarding issues in the area.

Having an extension to the existing hotel could increase safeguarding issues. In addition, there may be a line of sight from the proposed hotel extension into the playground. Another safeguarding issue.

For these reasons, I urge the appeal to be disallowed.