

Joanne Atherton
Howden House
1 Union Street
Sheffield
S1 2SH

From [REDACTED]

Reference planning number : 20/04177/FUL

16.12.21

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to provide comments and an objection to the revised planning application above. The reasons for my objection are outlined below. These are in addition to the previous objections provided and outlined below, when the application was originally rejected.

Flood risk: The development is within 20 meters of a water course which is an underground stream. This was evidenced when on the 15th June the builders began to dig a large hole for a soakaway and the bucket on the digger was bringing up the underground water course. The hole in the ground immediately filled with water, to represent a pond. The builder contacted Yorkshire Water as they believed they had damaged an underground water pipe. Yorkshire Water carried out tests and confirmed this was not a water pipe and stated that the water was the responsibility of the developer. The builder then informed me a few days later that he had received instructions from the developer to fill in the hole, as there was a health and safety risk of someone falling into the water. All the water from the hole then drained directly onto my property, under my bungalow and then onto the highway. This is the area where the application to build an additional dwelling is being made.

Incorrect information on the planning application regarding flood risks: The developer has ticked a box to state there is not a water course within 20 meters of the development. The information above is evidence to state this is not correct. Due to the underground stream and amount of water on this site the soakaways that the developer is proposing in the plans will not be adequate and there is a significant risk of flooding.

I have previously requested and I urgently request again, your confirmation of who will hold the responsibility of flood and water damage to my home.

Lack of suitable drainage on the development causing damage to my property: The existing soakaways, to service the existing buildings on the site do not work effectively. In January this year I contacted the builders to report that water had run into my garden and flooded into my garage. The builders informed me that the developer would come down to inspect the damage and the problem, yet nobody came.

Not complying with Land Drainage instructions: I contacted the Land Drainage department in March to inform them of the issue with water draining onto my property. Later in the year they informed me that they had advised the developer to install a large drainage pipe and to connect this to a culvert. To date this work has not been completed and my property continues to serve as a drain for the existing 5 houses and garages on the development site.

Biodiversity on the development site: Previous site studies found evidence of bats in the old stone house which was demolished. The developer has stated on this application that there are no biodiversity considerations for the site and new bat boxes have not yet been installed.

Sewage disposal: The proposed development site is situated below main road level and the plans show the sewage pipe will need to be connected to the main drain on High Street, which is at a much higher elevation than the development. Water and sewage cannot run up hill, creating a potential future sewage issue.

Close proximity to a bridle path: The proposed site sits directly next to a bridle path. The only way for the builder to take diggers, lorries and dumper trucks to the site would be down the bridle path and this presents a danger to the pedestrians using the path, which I believe is against the law.

Previous objections and further considerations:

1. The revised planning development includes the construction of an additional house which is on the boundary of my land. The new proposed house would be constructed only meters away from my home, overlooking rear windows to my bedroom and bathroom, with the result of blocking out all natural day light and privacy. This means that people would be able to look directly inside my bedroom window on the ground floor. For example, 3 months ago I entered my bedroom and a builder on the site was able to smile and wave at me.
2. The elevation of the land, which slopes higher than the land of my property, increases the visual impact of the proposed property and over dominance over my one storey bungalow.
3. The development already consists of 5 4 storey properties, all of which have a significant over dominance on my home and restrict light into my garden and living room. The elevation of the land increases the visual impact of all the new development, which is not in keeping with the neighbourhood and the development of low rise bungalow's on Fernlea Grove.
4. There are serious concerns, which have still not been addressed by either the developer or the planning department about the impact of drainage to the site. Since the development commenced significant amounts of water have run onto my property, flooding into my garage, garden and with concerns over damage to my home. I would like your confirmation about which party will be liable to pay for the water damage to my home and property.
5. The original plans had the area for the proposed development to be landscaped and I would strongly assert that this is the best use of this land as the impact of any further development would be unsuitable for the space and proximity to my home. This could be landscaped with berry bearing bushes, to encourage the biodiversity of the site and encourage birds and would life to return. This would support Sheffield City councils new Greening Up policy.
6. The proximity of the new proposed dwelling to my home would not only impact on the amount of daylight, there are serious concerns over the impact of noise pollution and light pollution from a dwelling so close to my bedroom and home.

I trust that you take these concerns into serious account and the already overdeveloped nature of the site.

Yours sincerely,

Cc Cllr Vic Bowden