

**5 May 2021 - DM2020/01062 - Development Land North Side
And Adjoining 1 To 12 Bishops Place, Sutton - Objector**



The following Written Statement has been received regarding the above planning application.

04/29/2021 12:00:02

Name

Brian Cruickshank

Role and organisation (if any)

Interest in the application

Objector

Written Statement

"We have an easement under deed in order to access our garages. The driveway is narrow, the exit (onto part of the Red Route) is challenging – traffic waiting to exit onto Carshalton Rd & entering from Carshalton Rd. The adjacent Garage & Tyre Fitters exacerbates the situation.

Luke Simpson emailed Heidi Duncan on 1 March "the swept path analysis does not cover the actual turning radius required for waste and fire vehicles to enter the access to the site from either St Barnabas or Lind Road, which would be very tight". In the Report to Planning Committee (§7.60) "the access to the site from St Barnabas Road complies in terms of the minimum width requirements for waste vehicles, and a swept path analysis has been submitted which shows an adequate turning radius can be achieved from the main highway". Such swept path analysis has not been published.

I have emailed the Planning Department about this apparent major discrepancy and am told it will be brought to Luke Simpson's attention when he returns on 4 May. We have no chance of seeing or commenting. Very inappropriate – I am being prevented from making any comment.

The narrow unlit driveway is totally unsuitable as a route for pedestrians, children, prams, wheelchairs and bicycles, in addition to cars, service and delivery vehicles – which will not just be going to/from the proposed development, but elsewhere in Bishops Place – even a through route. Bishops Place is similarly unlit and not maintained at Public Expense.

The footprint of the new development is too large for the site, very small gardens with access only through the living areas of the houses. The amenity space of the duplexes is said to be balconies of 6sqm to 8sqm (§4.3) – has Plot 5 got the 7sqm amenity space mandated by the



Housing SPG?

Planning Application refused in 2018 showed the proposed building being 27 metres from our property – granting this application will leave us looking at a 3-storey, 10m high brick wall, just 21 metres from our property (§7.33) – much less from our garden.

The occupiers of adjacent premises all disagree with the assertion (§2.5) that "The proposal would not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers". There are many objections that people will be able to see into their gardens and properties from windows and second floor balconies.

§7.48 is wrong – St Barnabas Rd was added to the CPZ in 2020, and the adjoining Bramley Rd will become an inevitable target for no CPZ permit.

”