

# Comments for Planning Application 21/02839/PLF

## Application Summary

Application Number: 21/02839/PLF

Address: Manor Farm Low Field Lane Haisthorpe East Riding Of Yorkshire YO25 4NX

Proposal: Erection of a lean-to extension to be used for agricultural machinery storage and repair

Case Officer: Mrs Amy Barrett

## Customer Details

Name: Dr Mark Slater

Address: Jacksons Barn, Low Field Lane, Haisthorpe Driffield, East Riding Of Yorkshire YO25 4NX

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We would like to take this opportunity to object to the drainage proposal attached to the extension to Manor Farm outbuildings. In principle, we do not have any objection to the erection of the proposed structure. However, we do have concerns regarding the drainage proposal on various levels:

- The proposed drainage site is within the boundary or another property (i.e. ours) . I would have assumed that the council would have contacted all stakeholders regarding the proposed development to seek their views. We have had no contact from any parties regarding the drainage proposal.
- On reading the proposal, this is not what was discussed with the proposer during previous discussion. I will state that I had an amicable conversation with the proposer regarding draining into MY pond. I was happy to agree that a further drainage pipe could be installed but that if my current overflow was insufficient then (with acceptable planning) he would assist with the provision of a larger drainage pipe. At no point have we discussed the provision of a weir or outflow chamber and the use of our garden as an 'overflow'.
- Please see figure 20 of the '#Flood Assessment Risk' - the proposed water flow is incorrect
- Please see figure 21 - 'Attenuated Pond Design' This photo does in no way capture the pond at its resting height. At present the pond level can be adjusted to suit the time of the year and is kept high in spring to allow for summer evaporation. This photo was obviously taken during summer as the pond normally never goes this low in autumn or winter. In autumn and winter the depth is much greater than illustrated. Also, the outlet is currently positioned around 4 inches below maximum level, not the stated 18 inch - which does suggest a much higher capacity that is achievable.
- Please look at photo 22 - would you be happy for your patio, trampoline and playhouse to be potentially flooded in the event of an overflow?? I feel that with no benefit to us this is

unacceptable.

- Regarding the overflow zone - to maintain my property, I am required to move equipment through this area and would be unable to do so should this area be flooded.

- Subsequent to the previous structure construction, I have had to brick up a gate to my rear courtyard because of continual flooding in this area. I will state that the proposer was very helpful one evening and built a dam to divert the water into the pond. This did alleviate the immediate flooding problem but somewhat diverted this to another section of my property but luckily, we had enough bags and sand to make a further barrier. This was all due to surface drainage, not because of the buildings (in my opinion) but more likely the hard standing area which is on a slope to the two neighboring properties.

- The drainage document does tend to suggest that there are currently no issues. After I consulted the proposer, he was very accommodating in allowing me to install a surface drain at the end of my property where the 'slope' from Manor Farm yard ends. At this time, I had severe damp in the room. Fortunately, this is no longer the case, and I would like to thank Mark for his permission to install this. I would be worried that should the proposed drainage plan fail, then this room could once again become uninhabitable. The room is used by my elderly mother-in-law who has had an organ transplant and would be extremely susceptible to respiratory infection quite often and especially during convalescence.

- The proposed drainage scheme states that there must be site maintenance. I would like to once again state that the pond is not within the site of the proposer.

- Looking at the recommendation, if I were to agree to the placement of the overflow/weir then I would essentially be bound by the conditions of the proposal and lose all control of my pond and portion of my garden. This would make most of my garden potentially inaccessible

- As for the maintenance schedule stated. I would like to know who would be expected to undertake this and, if the maintenance was carried out incorrectly, then who would be liable for the flooding costs of Jacksons Barn and or Linton Manor as the cause would be located on my property and not Manor Farm. Really creates a large legal issue in my mind.

- Consultation from the council and proposer would have been appreciated before I was told by a further 3rd party of the plans in store for my property/garden.

- I would like to thank Neil Pick for the very detailed Flood Risk Assessment. I would however like to point out that nowhere in this document does he state that the pond and potential flood zone belongs to a third party. Looking through the report, it does appear that the land in question is wasteland, or on the site of manor farm.

Photographic and video evidence is available if required to support continued drainage issues since erection of last building which was passed after our objection on drainage issues. I am very sorry that I am logging this objection but feel no choice since the proposer has lacked in communication regarding his intentions on our garden. I am equally aggrieved that the council has not taken any steps to notify of this planning proposal as this does directly affect our property, pond and garden.

Under no circumstance will any permission be granted for groundwork within the boundary of our property.

