

Dear Sir/Madam,

We have lived at 21 Greenway for 16 years, our property is adjacent to the proposed re-development.

Overall, we believe that the proposal has been designed well, with comments taken into consideration throughout the development phase. There is a need for further care home requirements within the area to support the local population. It is also clear that without this redevelopment the care home as it stands may be uneconomical and could cease to exist which would be detrimental to the local area and economy.

We are generally supportive of the application but have the following comments, which we wish to be taken into consideration in the determination of this proposed development and reflected in any decision notice and/or accompanying planning conditions issued by the council.

For those items we are proposing to be conditioned, we do believe that they meet the six tests and requirements for planning conditions as set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. As such will mitigate what otherwise would be seen as an adverse effect of the proposed development.

Modifications:

1. The one area of the application that does concern us is the additional parking for staff that is being proposed on the northern boundary. The proposed development site has ample areas away from dwellings within the red line boundary and as such we believe that bringing car parking close to housing on Greenway is unnecessary as this could be accommodated elsewhere on the site. We would like to see the applicant relocate this area of car parking away from local dwellings, ideally to the south of the development to ensure the area remains free from all forms of infrastructure and the residential amenity is protected.
2. Smoking area – staff occasionally use an unauthorised structure at the back of the care home to smoke which is detrimental to the health of local residents on Greenway and a certain times of year infiltrates local dwellings. The plans for the proposed development should include a designated smoking area which is not near the northern boundary of the proposed development and a sufficient distance from local dwellings. We note that the staff areas are at the top of the proposed development with external emergency stairs due to be refurbished. We therefore believe it is important that these are designated for strict emergency use only and not for recreation use by staff, such as smoking or access to the car park.

Proposed elements to be conditioned:

1. We are concerned that any earthworks along the boundary between our property and the proposed development could cause detriment to our land and boundary fence as the current plans show a difference in elevation of up to 1 metre without any retaining structures being proposed. Within the planning condition for the Construction Management Plan we wish to see a specific line item listed to consider earthworks along our boundary and requirement to seek approval from the adjoining property on proposed measures. Reason: to ensure the proposed development does not impact on the stability of the adjoining land and, to safeguard adjoining properties and amenity.

2. Whilst the applicant has proposed measures for tree planting we would request that the Council condition the applicant to develop a Tree Management Plan that not only considers the felling and replanting but the ongoing management of vegetation on the site for the lifetime of the development. Specifically, so it limits the heights of certain tree species, such as Leylandii Cypress to 5m. This should be a pre-commencement condition and required before construction works commence. Reason: to safeguard and enhance the appearance of the complete development and visual amenity of the locality. And to protect residential amenity of adjoining properties.
3. In addition, we wish the Council to condition the applicant within its Construction Management Plan to establish a consultative committee with residents from the adjoining properties during both the pre-construction phase and construction phase. We believe that development can be a positive collaboration where parties work together to ensure transparency. Reason: to maintain regular dialogue prior and throughout the duration of the works to provide updates on the scheduled works and any changes that may occur as a result of unforeseen circumstances.
4. With the increase in capacity of the nursing home we believe that given the service entrance is close to neighbouring dwellings on Greenway that the Council should condition the hours of its usage, with the exception of staff shift changeovers and emergency ambulances or care requirements, to the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00 to 13:00 on weekends and public holidays. Reason: to protect to the residential amenity of adjoining properties.
5. During construction we would also like the Council to specifically condition the hours of audible construction noise from the proposed development to 07:30 to 17:00 on Monday to Friday, 07:30 to 13:00 on Saturdays and no working on Sundays or Public Holidays.

We would also encourage the Council to consider with this proposed development the safety of the local road network and work with the applicant to consider a contribution under a S106 to improve the safety of the surrounding road network through traffic calming measures. With the increase capacity of the nursing home there will be an increase capacity of traffic on the local road network as a resulting from proposed development site both during construction and its ongoing operational lifetime.

We hope that our comments are constructive and we would be open to further dialogue with both the council and the applicant.

Your faithfully

Dr Mike Anderson and Mrs S Anderson

Cc.

Interim Executive Member for Planning and Transport – Cllr Daniel Allen

Planning Control Chair - Councillor Elizabeth Dennis

Local Councillors – Councillor David Chalmers, Councillor Sean Prendergast, Councillor Claire Winchester

Local MP – Chris Hinchliff MP