



I wish to formally object to the revised planning application for the proposed change of use of 17 Far View Crescent into a children's home.

Although the applicant has reduced the stated number of children from four to three (possibly four), the concerns raised in previous objections remain entirely unresolved. This is the fourth application following one withdrawal and two refusals based on essentially the same proposal. The only significant change is the use of an agent to produce a more polished submission; the substance is unchanged.

#### Unsuitable Location

The property is in a quiet residential cul-de-sac, making it wholly unsuitable for this type of development. Increased traffic, parking pressures, and congestion would have a negative impact on residents. The application claims a 1:1 staff-to-child ratio but states two staff will be on duty both day and night. This inconsistency raises questions about true staffing numbers and the resulting traffic.

#### Parking Concerns

The site cannot accommodate four or five vehicles without constant manoeuvring. The proposed parking policy directing staff to park on adjoining streets merely shifts the problem elsewhere, creating inconvenience and potential safety issues for neighbours.

#### Safety & Suitability of the Property

There are serious concerns regarding the property's suitability for vulnerable children. The first-floor balcony presents a potential safety hazard, and previous objections raised the issue of asbestos in the building. It is unclear whether this has been investigated or addressed.

Over the years, attempts have been made to convert this property from residential to commercial use, each met with strong community opposition. The current pattern of submitting only slightly altered applications, alongside the continued presence of a "To Let" sign, suggests a strategy of persistence rather than genuine engagement with local concerns. This undermines the integrity of the planning process.

#### Summary of Grounds for Objection:

- Location is wholly unsuitable for the proposed use.
- Traffic, parking, and safety concerns remain unresolved.
- The property itself poses potential risks to intended occupants.
- Repeated resubmissions appear to be an attempt to gain approval through attrition rather than by addressing valid concerns.

Under Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, repeated applications without substantive change may be refused on the same grounds as before.

For these reasons, I strongly object to this application and reaffirm my full support for all objections submitted in response to earlier versions of this proposal.