

Fw: Objection to PA/2025/680

From Planning <Planning@northlincs.gov.uk>

Date Wed 06/08/2025 08:45

To [REDACTED]

 1 attachment (21 KB)

Objections to PA 2025 680.docx;

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

Tel: 01724 297000

Please let us know what you think about the customer service you received during your enquiry by completing our customer satisfaction survey on our Consultations Page on the council web site:

<http://ow.ly/4mNWDJ>

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent: 04 August 2025 10:14

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

Subject: Objection to PA/2025/680

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External Email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.


Dear Sir,

Please see attached objection to PA/2025/680

Would you please confirm receipt of this objection,

Many thanks

Kind regards

 Pilkington

Objections to PA/2025/680- Planning permission to vary condition 1 of [PA/2023/56](#) (Approval of Reserved Matters dated 27/09/2023 namely to undertake external alterations to all Plots and changes to the approved landscaping scheme

The same site plans have been submitted for three planning applications, PA/2021/1136, PA/2023/56 and this current application

There are no dimensions shown on any of the plans and two different scales used.

These plans are out of scale and line to the actual construction and do not represent the true site view. See Google Earth for comparison

Plots 1 and 2 have been built approx one metre closer to the boundary trees than the plans show, and the other plots are also in the wrong position to the drawings submitted.

PA/2021/1136 shows a large buffer zone around all of the plots for existing wildlife, in order to comply with LC11 conditions i.e. 'to preserve the openness and character of the area'.

PA/2023/56 takes part of the buffer zone into plot 5. It does not show the correct siting of the properties. It also now refers to the all of the buffer zone as 'occupants turfed lawn'

PA/2025/680 shows garden gates, walkways and ornamental planting in the drastically reduced buffer zone. In real terms this buffer zone will be reduced to barely 6 meters around plots 3, 4 and 5.

Proposed paths around properties will disturb any wildlife and negate the LC11 conditions originally imposed, an Area of Amenity Importance. It is also difficult to envisage how all these proposed areas of planting can be incorporated into such small parcels of land, Now that the properties are in various stages of construction it can be seen how small the areas behind the properties actually are.

What is the reason for a third proposed alteration to the landscaping area? The landscaping should only apply to the areas directly around the actual properties, i.e hedging and shrubs. The coloured keys on the site plan shown do no match the proposed alterations. The original LC11 areas must be retained as originally shown and approved on PA/2021/1136. This area must be kept open and separate in order to retain the character of the site and not turn the land into a concrete and resin abomination. The buffer zone must not developed into walkways and conflicted by planting rows. Existing vegetation should be left to multiply with time and for existing wildlife to thrive.

There should not be access to these areas by gates from occupants as this will disturb and destroy the wildlife activity

There is another application submitted, PA/2025/679 which is for discharge of some of the original planning conditions imposed. This is not for public comment. The Case Officer and the Tree Officer have approved these plans. The drawing 1883.001 Rev B shows the proposed new landscaping which makes a mockery of biodiversity. Fortunately NLC Ecology refused to discharge this condition. Hopefully this condition can be re-assessed and the buffer zone can revert to that which was originally passed and accepted by the developer in 2021.

The application shows further soil to be removed, in additions to the hundreds of tonnes that has already gone, to rid the site of any existing Japanese knotweed. This will strip the little existing soil which is necessary for good drainage.

Most of the site has already had topsoil removed and is down to clay which does not drain.

In the winter of 2023 the whole site was a lake and the builder had to pump out water from the footings. It follows that some future winters will be the same.

Japanese Knotweed is still growing and visible on this site at present.

This latest application is a land grab exercise. With each application the buffer zone becomes more seriously reduced. Compare the site plans on each application to see this has happened. Now that the houses are in the course of construction it can be clearly seen how little personal amenity each plot has. So, the developer needs to make the individual sites more attractive to a prospective purchaser by adding more garden to each, to the detriment of the buffer zone. The approved original plans in PA/2021/1136 should be abided by, as per the report of NLC Officer who comments that trees, hedgerows and shrubs of high diversity is to be used in planting. 'The application should only be permitted in this area if it can be demonstrated that the open character will be protected and the visual amenity and wildlife value will be enhanced'

Extended property gardens are contrary to the first approved application

Plots 1 and 2 have only approx. 5 metres of rear garden only, due to being built in the wrong position.

NLC were advised of this and have taken no action, so presumably approved the change. See PA/2025/679. Now there is no buffer zone shown on these plots which was on the original approved application. There is no diversity level here at all in these two plots. There are only proposed lawned gardens down to the boundary trees (which are not the property of the developer) which will be detrimental to existing wildlife. There is no assurance that new occupants will not take down parts of this boundary tree line, in order to give themselves much needed amenity garden that is not in shade, which has the possibility of making the existing trees unstable. Obviously it is not their responsibility to maintain these trees. That is why the buffer zone must be maintained on Plots one and two, for consideration and respect to the owner of the boundary hedge and to comply with the first original planning condition imposed.

A second NLC comment as per PA/2021/1136-

'In our view, development should only be permitted in this area if it can be demonstrated that the open character will be protected and the visual amenity and wildlife value will be enhanced.'

This application now shows a pond on Plot 3.

This plot is 27 metres from property to boundary. How large is this pond proposed to be? Plans still show a buffer zone behind this pond.

Will it hold stagnant water? Will it become an unhealthy/unsafe area? Maybe it is intended to be an overflow area for a known historic flooded site?

Will this water have any impact on the residents of Ash Tree Close whose houses are the other side of the boundary line?

Is this pond then to be a garden water feature when future occupants ignore the buffer zone and take it over as a personal garden?

Is there to be any guarantee that, over time, this buffer zone will not be incorporated into personal property to each plot, thus eliminating biodiversity and wildlife?

This whole site is a basin, being much lower than the area around it. Historically it has had previous ponds which demonstrated how the land naturally holds water.

Residents on the High Street also deserve protection from the buffer zone as there is local flooding to these properties when we have extreme rain and this area provides space for water run off.

The surface water management report in PA/2021/1136 says that main drainage, tanks and outfall to culverted watercourse are to be built prior to any phase of construction on site.

This has not been done to date- why?

LLFA drainage team objected to PA/2021/1136 re confirmation of the holding tanks required.

However, this has now been passed on PA/2025/679, as copied below, although sight of the document used to grant the condition is not available to see.

'LLFA Drainage have reviewed the submitted information and raise no objection. This condition is discharged on the basis of the details supplied in the document 'Planning Condition 14 Detail', received by the LPA on 09/06/2025'

If drainage had been installed first, as required by surface water management, then the true scale and perspective of this development would have been clearer, prior to construction beginning.

Maybe then the properties would have been built in the correct place.

Drainage will also have to be installed around plots one and two, potentially causing further damage to the existing boundary, which is not owned by this developer, in addition to damage that has already occurred.

It is now almost two years since work began on this site. There is no indication of how much longer this project is to continue. Dozens of properties have been built in this village since work began on this site. They are now occupied. We have no idea of when we may be allowed to settle back into everyday life without a construction site and its disruption around us.

I have one large boundary tree that is suffering from crown decline, possibly due to root damage from construction, with soil compaction and tonnes of limestone on the access road restricting water and nutrient uptake. My boundary fences have all moved and sunk. There is no drainage in the access road, heavy vehicles are constantly passing my property and there is no end in sight for the completion of the site. Yet I will have no comeback and no-one in authority to support any claim that I might make.

Although I refer to the other planning applications for this development, this objection is referring to PA/2025/680, but other previous decisions are all relevant.

This application is to vary condition one of PA/2023/56 (4 reasons)

The second reason was that all approved landscaping should be carried out within 12 months of development being commenced. Obviously this has not been started or this current application would not be put forward for consideration and approval. But why was this not followed by by NLC?

This developer has continued to ignore previous conditions, to carry on regardless, to build according to their own ideas, irrespective of plans submitted. To build to their own size, design and more importantly being unable to follow their own plans in respect of the siting of the properties.

The first approved application had 24 conditions to be complied with. Subsequent applications are to discharge many of them, in effect altering the original conditions imposed. Surely a local authority expects their original requirements to be adhered to and maintained?

It appears that the developer now wants the development to be almost butted up to the houses which surround the site. This takes away the openness of the site and leaves existing residents with no recourse.

Almost two years on from commencement there are only 3 houses to be considered in the course of construction. There is not one property with any windows or doors, no drainage on site, no water on site, no electricity, nor any utilities laid or provided for. There is no end in sight for this development.

█ Pilkington

4th August 2025