

Dear Planning Committee,

I would like to comment with respect to planning application DM2020/00781.

As a resident of the affected site (Waddon House), I'd like to object to the proposed planning application on the reasons laid out below.

Although I've previously commented on this particular application, I would very much appreciate it if my views on how I believe my life and the lives of others on the site would be negatively impacted if the proposed development were to go ahead.

Parking availability

At present the site has space for 65 car parking spaces (EXISTING_SITE_PLAN-4479548.pdf states that there's 66 car parking spaces however space 49 doesn't exist) to serve the 87 current leaseholders.

The application seeks to reduce this to 52 spaces whilst increasing the number of site leaseholders by a further 8.

It's been noted within the planning application that full capacity on the current 65 spaces hasn't yet been reached meaning the accommodation of the further 8 leaseholders and their car requirements is possible as things stand.

However, to summarise my previous objection in this regards, take up of these spaces would likely be higher if the price of a parking space wasn't so prohibitively expensive. Parking on the strip of Kings Way adjacent to Waddon House is packed at almost all times of day with vehicle owners, at least some if not most, being Waddon House leaseholders who would use the on site parking if it could be afforded. Parking further down Kings Way into the industrial estate increases the likelihood of vehicle crime (I've observed a small number of damaged cars further down the road during my time in the area) meaning it's really not a preferable option. Removing the currently unused car parking spaces whilst introducing more leaseholders to the site also removes any future possibility of those who are currently priced out of purchasing a space (and future leaseholders) from acquiring a space.

Moving on from my previously raised concerns over car parking, an additional car parking related concern has since come to light.

There have been a number of building or mobile phone mast maintenance projects over the past 2 years (I believe 4) which has made it necessary to place a Cherry picker or a much larger Crane in the site car park.

Each project has needed between 1-2 visits from the Cherry picker in some instances, the Crane in others. With each visit, between 12 and 22 car parking spaces have had to be vacated.

To add to this, last years phone mast maintenance work dragged on far beyond the planned time (6-7 months in the end) meaning a number of car parking spaces near the Waddon House back door were 'closed' throughout in order to allow for the storage of maintenance materials on site.

A 5th project concerning yet more telephone mast maintenance work has now just begun and during 10th November we once again lost a number of our car parking spaces in order to accommodate a Crane. At the time of writing, it is known that the Crane is due back but we've not yet been advised when.

There will be more instances of this type over the coming years and each time we'll need to free up our car parking spaces at our inconvenience. These repeated planned intrusions and occasional subsequent further unplanned intrusions into our car park have become a fact of life for us the Waddon House leaseholders which we've just had to live through. It wasn't ever previously advised that this would be the case.

Up until now it's been possible to simply park else where in the car park during this work. However, if the additional car parking spaces are removed, up to 22 cars will then need to overspill into the surrounding

area. The planning application makes no real recognition of this aspect of life for the leaseholders meaning serious planning towards mitigation has been minimal.

Refuse & Recycling Store capacity

Adding to my previous commentary on this subject, in section 4.7 *Access Statement* (within DM2020_00781-DAS_WADDON_ANNEX-4485096.pdf) the applicant calculates a need for a total of 9 x 1,100L Euro bins plus 1 x 770L Euro bin in order to serve the combined needs of the current 87 leaseholders and additional 8 proposed leaseholders. The proposed Refuse & Recycling store appears sized to accommodate exactly this and the needed access to each bin.

The current site refuse store has 18 x 1,100L Euro bins (9 for residual waste, 9 for dry mixed recycling waste).

As of 7pm on Sunday 29th November (a fairly typical Sunday evening), the day before bin collection, 7 of the 9 Residual waste bins and 4 of the 9 recycling waste bins were filled – 11 bins filled in total. This has come from just the original 87 leaseholders.

Based on this, and to further underline my previously submitted point, I don't believe the combined predicted refuse capacity is realistic when taking into account the real life needs of the current 87 leaseholders not to mention the additionally proposed 8 new leaseholders.

The proposed Refuse & Recycling Store would need to fit more than the predicted 9 x 1,100L Euro Bins plus 1 x 770L Euro bin. From the looks of the plans, it would appear that no more bins can be added to the store which would lead to an overflow of refuse on a normal week. At peak times of year (such as Christmas), this overflow would be much worse. I don't believe the site leaseholders should have to live through this.

Boundary security

The planning application seeks to remove the Stafford Road facing wall and replace it with what appears to be a lower in height iron railing with a hedge situated right behind (referencing section 4.4 *Landscape* within DM2020_00781-DAS_WADDON_ANNEX-4485096.pdf).

This looks and feels like a reduction in security to the site. It looks like it would be easier than it is at present to peak over the boundary and then climb and traverse the front boundary in order to access the path behind which eventually takes you round the proposed building to the car park (according to the proposed site plan). From a security point of view, at the least, it's not an improvement on what we currently have. At worse, it detracts from the deterrent that the current wall provides.

In summary, the objective of increasing housing for the wider area by further utilising Brown Field and previously developed on land is certainly noted and agreed with.

But to do so whilst negatively impacting the existing residents lives in the ways referenced above is deeply unfair and should be factored into the decision making process.

Kind Regards

Lawrence Aggrey-Fynn