

Everything I said in my previous comments still stands.

### It is unclear what is being applied for

I have been asked to comments about the applicant's changes, and new documents. I have spent ages trying to understand what those changes are, but, there is so much ambiguity and contradiction, I am not 100% clear what is current. I suggest the old/superseded documents be placed in a Superseded folder, with only relevant documents appearing within Plans. This also includes the applicant's narrative, within Supporting Information, which needs updating, because they are justifying, for example, car ports, but (it may be) they are no longer planned. My concern is that, without it being clear, you may presume I'm OK with certain aspects of the plans, but it may just be I was not able to untangle the contradictions. As a result, you might choose to pass something having a real negative impact on me, which I feel is unfair. So, I ask, for fairness, you do this and re-open the application, with an extended consultation period, so I have an opportunity to sit down, and go through it.

I want to say that, regardless of that, there are still some points I want to mention.

### Four storeys, the thin end of the wedge

I do not agree with these dwellings being made four storey. I believe that would result in changes throughout the site that means they majority of the development will then be made the same. I see the developer is already lifting the ground level, across the site, such that everything appears to sit a lot higher than it ought to have. I fear, allowing four storeys will just make the raised elevations more evident. I am also concerned that roads, and parking bays will also be elevated. Just looking at the turning head that is in the process of being built, facing the farm, it is ridiculously high in comparison to the farm's existing garden level. To me the turning head is just appalling. From memory, the Local Plan talks about new development fitting in. How can this be said to do that. It is not subtle, and hits you in the face. Concrete truck, after truck, keep turning up, filling it with concrete. There is so much concrete it is ridiculous.

### Poor design, by design

So many of these new houses are going to see people's lowest floors being effectively bunkers, while their cars sit a storey above. It just seems crackers. And people will enter their properties, and have to immediately walk downstairs, with their weekly shop, into the bunker, where the kitchen will be. And then there are designs that would see new residents afforded a concrete hole, with a view of the sky, in place of a garden.

### Parking proposal fail

The parking proposal is for three cars to park, as seen in the illustration. This sees one car being boxed in; unable to drive away because of the other cars around it. If people are starting/finishing work at different times, they might not necessarily want to start shunting cars around. This could mean only two cars are parked in the bays, with a third, regularly parked on the road. But then that creates problems, with cars impacting traffic up and down the road. This is already starting to be seen, with building site workers now parking on Lingards Road, and narrowing it.



There are many users of Lingards Road; some with trailers. One regular user is already concerned he will struggle to pull his horse box, up and down the road, which will cause him a problem; especially as he can be called out at any time of day or night, for his work, and the prospect of not being able to get to his place of work is really concerning him.

Any new development is supposed to be about providing future amenity, not just about now. I know new dwellings must only, legally, have one charging point. However, the way the parking is proposed, there would, likely, be a cable trailing across the paving, at some point, as each car is charged. Surely, it would make more sense to have it such that the cars could, if residents choose to install them, have their own charging point that negates the need for these otherwise trailing cables. That would mean the dwellings move further into the field, to accommodate this setup, but it makes more sense to do that now than wish it had been done later, when it is too late.

### Wrong priorities

The way the applicant's narrative reads, for plot 23, in my opinion, it is asking the reader to sympathise with the needs of the potential residents. That, without allowing a fourth storey to be permitted, the house would not be good enough for them. By objecting, my interpretation is, we would be denying them something they really need; three storeys are insufficient; and it would be mean to deny them a fourth. Yet, I am aware the UK national average, of students having free school meals, is 24.6%. But, one local school has a figure that is nearly 50%. Some students attend local schools wearing trainers, which are then swapped for shoes, each day, which the school provide, to allow those students to meet uniform standards. I also know there are local children that have to sleep on sofas, their homes having insufficient bedrooms. Why am I mentioning this? It is because these facts speak to the needs of the local area, where £899k houses seem obscene. Offering what I see as a sob storey, to justify a fourth storey, seems distasteful. If approved, I fear future developments would automatically see four storeys being applied for, with this one as justification for allowing it. There are no four storeys locally, and I believe this application should be judged against that, not a sob story.

Following on from that, on Tuesday, 3<sup>rd</sup> September, the site had a delivery, at just turned 7:30am. Yet, the applicant's CEMP states there will be no deliveries before 9:30am, as a result of children travelling to school. However, on my way to work, having just seen the delivery in question, a young

schoolchild ran across the road, in front of me, not 100m from the site entrance; highlighting the very dangers the developer is aware of. It therefore seems sickening, to me, that the safety of local children is ignored, at the same time the developer wants to be allowed to save money, allowing a fourth storey to be built. If saving money is placed ahead of child safety, something is very wrong. The two can co-exist, but to forego the latter, for the former, is not something I can support.